



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

STAT

Vol. 110

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, AUGUST 20, 1964

No. 164

## Senate

(Proceedings of the Senate continued  
from the Record of August 19, 1964)

### WARMAKING POLICIES OF THE UNITED STATES IN ASIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a further sampling of the correspondence I have received in the last few days in support of my position concerning the warmaking policies of the United States in Asia.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LYNWOOD, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Bully for you—the one man with sufficient sanity and courage to shake a fist and rally the Nation against our warmongers.

Your article in the Progressive is correct. We are pursuing neither law nor peace nor freedom in southeast Asia.

Have just wired President Johnson: "Get out of civil war in Vietnam and seek international conference. United States is aggressor and provocateur."

I feel sure the Nation will rally to your side. I am joining a group for vigil on Hollywood Boulevard Saturday night. Keep slugging.

Respectfully,

Mrs. FRANCES SAUNDERS.

AUGUST 13, 1964.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Thank you for your very courageous stand on Vietnam. Yours is one of the few sane voices heard these days.

I have been grateful to you for giving us the real facts.

Please keep up the good work. You are a great hero.

Admiringly,

ALFRED Wm. STAHL, Jr.,  
1st Lt. USAR (retired), formerly Admin-  
istrator Medical Laboratories Division,  
Pennsylvania Health Department.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,

August 10, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Congratulations on your refusal to give the President a blank check for the Vietnam crisis.

We are being kept in the dark far too much regarding our foreign policy. The public is

entitled to know how and why we got into the present mess in Vietnam. Is it true that our State Department tried to force Chang Kai Shek upon a hitherto friendly Viet Cong, and that this precipitated the trouble?

We Americans know that a war is going on and that we are wasting billions of dollars and, worse, lives, in a crazy conflict that is getting nowhere; that the whole thing is a mysterious, hushed-up catastrophe; that in the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations our foreign policy has been disastrous.

You could do our country a great service if you would come forth with a public analysis of the situation in southeast Asia, and the disasters caused by pouring billions into the pockets of crooked leaders whom their people hate.

Sincerely yours,

D. JACKSON.

P.S.—Is anything being done to protect the rights of men like Otepka? I am afraid McNamara is ruining our defense effort.

TUCSON, ARIZ.,  
August 13, 1964.

Re telegram, August 11, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

"Tucsonans support your proposals to negotiate to end aimless Vietnam war. Names follow."

Roslyn Einfrank, Hannah Cowell, Sue Hibbs, Virginia Walsh, Helen Goldblatt, Jane Webster, Debbie Hibbs, Mr. and Mrs. Vernon Elfbrandt, Sonia Gavin, A. Gavin, Lillian Kaplan, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Hammill, Doris Stanislawski, Dan Stanislawski, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Smith, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Martin, Milton Frank, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Clement, Mr. and Mrs. Jack Helmowitz, Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Goodman, Mrs. Helen Girard, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Berkowitz, Anne Poltere, Mr. and Mrs. Robert White, Mildred Faulkner, Mary Alice Forster, Gay Turner, Charles Turner, Mr. and Mrs. Ray Turner, Mr. and Mrs. George Miller, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Einfrank, Mr. and Mrs. Leon Gardner, Mr. and Mrs. Larry Dalrymple, Jane Webster, Elizabeth Estrada, Gladys Richardson, Mr. and Mrs. Gordon Hedgecock, Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Fessenbecker, Mr. and Mrs. Hy Rosen, Miss Sarah Sipkin, Mr. and Mrs. George Goldmark, Mr. and Mrs. George Cossack, Mr. and Mrs. Harold Eisenberg, Mr. and Mrs. Bill Shoult, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Oresman, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Zashin, Ellyn Frank, Leslie Forster.

DENVER, COLO.,  
August 12, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was glad that you spoke out in the Senate and presented your ideas on the Vietnam situation recently.

Sincerely,

Mrs. CHARLES FOREMAN.

CAMPBELLSPORT, WIS.,  
August 12, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon,  
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you on your stand in southeast Asia. Why should priceless American blood run to preserve corruption such as South Vietnam has in power thanks to our tax dollars.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE D. GUDEX.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 14, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I want to thank you for your courageous stand in the messy business of Vietnam and the foreign aid appropriation. Men like you give us faith that perhaps our son will be the citizen of a true democracy some day.

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES KORVIN.

YUCCA VALLEY, CALIF.,  
August 12, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I revere your courage and strength in holding out almost single handedly against those who are serving their political and financial ambitions by carrying on the aggressive and undeclared war against the people of Vietnam in support of a puppet government.

As a voter of California, I have no choice in voting but between candidates who pose as patriots by whooping for war, each trying to outdo the other. Your sanity and steadfastness during the shouting gives hope that reason and decency will emerge.

Very truly yours,

LUCY H. JOHNSON.

AUGUST 10, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Congress of the United States,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We have often had reason to commend you for your courageous speeches and votes advocating a sane foreign policy for our country. And although we have not

19851

19352

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 20

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

previously communicated our plaudits, we cannot allow your vote against the resolution authorizing President Johnson to take all steps necessary to "defend southeast Asia" to pass without expressing our deep appreciation.

Although it may be the case, as asserted in section 2 of the resolution, that maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia is vital to the national interests of the United States and to world peace, it is not clear to us that U.S. military intervention is the best or any way to secure such peace.

We regret and fear the situation in southeast Asia. We are obviously not experts on U.S. foreign policy; but given the information available to us, we feel that it is a tragic error to risk an already tenuous peace by active participation in the civil war of another country.

Although unable to express our commendation in the form of votes, it is our hope that your constituents will continue to return you to the Congress that your arguments for rationality will continue to reach a large audience.

Sincerely,

DONALD L. AND  
MERRILL B. PROVINCE.

STANFORD, CALIF.

SAN ANSELMO, CALIF.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I support your stand and vote on Vietnam.

Keep it up.

Sincerely,

JOE BUCHWALD.

MILL VALLEY, CALIF.,  
August 9, 1964.

Senator MORSE,  
The Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to take this chance to express my feelings about your actions during the Vietnam crisis and about your voting on the resolution.

Most admirable. Most courageous. Most levelheaded. Most mature.

Your insistence on truth and your kind of action is the kind of doing which reflects so well on all Americans.

America is not worth the life of one single American boy.

Sir, again my respect and admiration for your voice and vote of sanity in a time of great peril.

Sincerely,

PETER MERKIN.

TACOMA, WASH.,  
August 11, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I certainly applaud your rather lonesome stand on the proposal to step up the war in southeast Asia. I notice it is being bruited about quite openly that this idea was hatched in the mind of President Johnson as a Simon-pure political move to counter the Republican cry about being "soft on communism." That slogan is getting so badly shopworn that I wish we could have done with it. A courageous repudiation such as you so often demonstrate is the only constructive step in that direction. I wish a lot of other Senators would stand up and be counted as you do.

With brush fires breaking out all over and the tide of color rising as it is, our world could catch on fire any minute.

I want to think that a lot more people would flock to the Johnson standard if he would go all-out for a peaceful settlement in Asia rather than risk a snowdown with China as the present action suggests. No nation on earth can afford restraint as well as the United States.

Cordially,

STANLEY T. SHAW.

SEAL BEACH, CALIF.,

August 11, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your interview on foreign aid over KABC tonight was excellent. It is a blessing to have honest courageous men such as you and the Senator from Alaska as Members of the U.S. Senate.

Keep up the great work. You are correct in your positions on South Vietnam and foreign aid.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

EVAN THOMAS.

AUGUST 10, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: You must forgive me, a foreigner, for writing you but I felt I must do so in view of your speech of August 6 in Washington mentioned in the London Times. It is heartening to know that there is one voice in the great American Congress that is not silenced and overwhelmed by false patriotism. It is indeed a mark of statesmanship when a man can publicly question whether his own country's attitude in Vietnam might be a danger to peace and that there is at any rate a possibility that the United States was as much of a provocateur as North Vietnam. This sort of thing takes courage as your predecessors Tom Paine and Robert Ingersoll found in their day.

Your words find an echo amongst the many in Europe and elsewhere who have experienced war. Surely there is enough to do in the world, aye, and in one's own country without seeking trouble abroad. The mass of people want to live at peace to bring up their families in some sort of security. I have a daughter in New Jersey and two grandchildren there and from their letters I have formed the opinion that America (like every other country) could look after its own better instead of indulging (as we once did) in purposeless crusades in the East.

Again, sir, thank you for the first touch of sanity that I have read for some time. No, I'm not a Communist or fellow traveler.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE S. SPEED.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,  
August 13, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your courageous actions in the Senate of the United States on August 5, both for your speech against the resolution giving President Johnson advance approval for war in southeast Asia, and for your vote against the resolution. And I hardly agree with your position as outlined in that speech. It is unfortunate that only one of your colleagues in the Senate agrees with you on this vital matter, but there are a number of people, at least among my acquaintances who agree with you also.

How much longer will the United States continue to wage an undeclared war against an undisclosed enemy in conjunction with a militaristic despot whose only interest is his own political ambition? We have waged this type of war now for 10 years, supporting one dictator after another, without any signs of fighting for freedom, except in name. And all this in violation of the U.N. Charter, the Geneva agreement of 1954, and the Constitution of the United States. In short, this war may go down in history as one of the worst military and diplomatic debacles on record.

My own belief is that South Vietnam's premier, Nguyen Khanh, either provoked the attacks on American destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin, or else directed the attacks to be made himself. The only person who benefited at all from the conflict was Khanh,

whose hold on the government has been strengthened by the conflict; rumors of a new coup against him have been squelched. Further, his desire to escalate the war to the North has been vindicated. This theory is one of the most reasonable to be derived from the facts, and should certainly be considered seriously, although it merited no comment either in the press or among government officials.

I am convinced that, with the cost of the war approaching \$2 million a day, American deaths mounting, and our policies in Asia becoming more and more aggressive, our only choice is to withdraw our massive military commitment to southeast Asia, which only endangers the peace, freedom, and security of all mankind.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. JENSEN.

AUGUST 13, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to congratulate you and thank you for speaking out against our latest Vietnam action. You and Senator GREENING must have felt lonely in the Senate that day. I too believe that we can and must establish peace around the conference table. Then we must let Vietnam work out its own destiny with constructive help from us, if necessary.

Again, thank you for your courage and wisdom.

CHICAGO, ILL.

IDA TERKEL.

NAMPA, IDAHO,  
August 10, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am not a constituent of yours and unfortunately cannot vote for you, and indeed there have been times when I was poles apart from your viewpoint in national affairs.

However, I am writing to you what is in effect a "fan letter"—to tell you how I admired your stand on the President's sending our troops to Vietnam recently, and in his seeking extraordinary powers in this and other matters pertaining to war, declared or undeclared.

I do feel that communism is a great international threat and certainly I am not one of the "rather Red than dead" clan. However, I thrilled to the truth of the statement which you made on television "the whole of south Asia is not worth the death of one American boy."

I am writing to tell you how I applaud your stand in this and other matters recently and to tell you also that many, many others agree with you, who no doubt will not take the trouble to write and tell you so.

Sincere best wishes.

Yours,

MARION MARBEITER.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,  
August 10, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MCGOVERN: I am honestly confused about the almost blanket endorsement that Congress gave the President recently to go ahead with military action in Vietnam. It seems to me that this war has been almost as unpopular in this country as the Korean war was. I have sincere doubts that the action taken by Congress represented the will of the people.

I called one of my friends in the Council for a Livable World, who had earmarked funds sent to that council for your campaign. He could give no satisfactory explanation either, although he felt sure, he said, that you had some valid reasons for supporting this resolution. Two other friends I called were just as puzzled. They did agree with me that the United States seemed to be

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

1964  
Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

again flexing its muscles and asserting its "masculinity" by bypassing the U.N. Of course, we know that its "case" was referred to the U.N., but only after this country had taken unilateral action. This seems to negate the usefulness of the U.N. Must our own national security always come first before the security of the world (which is always threatened by the possibility of nuclear warfare)? If so, it seems to me that the U.N. is only a farce, and that we are simply giving it lipservice. It would be almost better (but not quite) to be honest and get out of it.

From what I heard WAYNE MORSE say twice on television recently and from his excellent article in the August Progressive, I am convinced that a protest vote should have been taken against the President's action. What do you have to say to Senator MORSE's advice that we should remember that Secretary Dulles refused to sign the Geneva agreement of 1954, an agreement whose violations we paradoxically now regard with grave concern. Didn't we violate the agreement ourselves when we gave aid to South Vietnam immediately after the agreement had been signed by other nations? Article 16 said: "The introduction into Vietnam of any troop reinforcements and additional military personnel is prohibited." Senator MORSE says that, for all practical purposes, the United States made a protectorate out of South Vietnam, sending 15,000 troops there by 1961 as "advisers." At no time, says the Senator, has South Vietnam had a government of its own choosing, but one established by coups of our proteges. Do we have a right to employ armed might to enforce an international agreement to which we were not a party?

Senator MORSE also points out that we are violating article 2, section 4; article 33, section 1; and article 37 of the U.N. Charter, an even more serious matter. I will be anxiously awaiting your explanation of your support for the President's actions in Vietnam, and my three friends have asked me to call them when I have heard from you and tell them what your answer is. Please believe the sincerity of my questioning. It is extremely difficult for the average citizen to know what is going on.

Congratulations, Senator MORSE, for your stand against the resolution.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOHN LEDGERWOOD.

MONTEREY PARK, CALIF.,  
August 12, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to congratulate you on your stand on the Vietnam situation. I acclaim your courage.

I am also writing to Congressman GEORGE BROWN and Senators KUCHEL and SALINGER of my support of your opinion.

Sincerely,

Mrs. EVELYN KOSTOVE.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.,  
August 12, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: First I want to express my appreciation for your heroic effort to modify our belligerent foreign policy which is doing so much damage to American prestige throughout the world. We may, with our bribes, hold the support of tyrannical rulers; but among the people everywhere abroad hatreds are building up against us because of our fanatical anti-Communist obsession. Bombs and napalm can only intensify the hatreds. Sooner or later we will have to accept coexistence and peaceful competition with the Communist world. Either that or coextermination. Preoccupation with the "Red menace" abroad has meant neglect of vital social reforms here at home. Internal

warfare, spreading crime, neuroses, misery and discontent—these are a bigger threat to our security. Bombers and battleships can't cope with this danger. Americans must face this fact. We can meet the Communist challenge only by building for a contented citizenry, not by dissipating our resources trying to build a world in our image. All social systems are changing, including communism. Let's compete peacefully and profit from each other's successes and failures, the true path to progress.

The Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions (Fund for the Republic subsidiary) have issued some fine booklets on our problems, including foreign policy. These are widely circulated here and abroad. I wonder if you, (or perhaps you in collaboration with Senators MCGOVERN, CHURCH, GROENING, and FULBRIGHT) would consider doing an effective essay that could be published by the center. I know some of the leaders in that institution and would be glad to discuss it with them. I am confident that they will welcome the idea. Please let me know how it strikes you. Much more should be done to awaken Americans to the danger of a nuclear holocaust resulting from miscalculation, escalation, or accident.

With best wishes, I remain,

Yours truly,

IRVING H. FLAMM.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
August 8, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: With all my heart I support the stand you have taken on the issue of Vietnam. I am shocked at the way in which the U.S. Government continues to ignore plain facts. The resolution supporting the President's ordering of air strikes against North Vietnamese bases amounts to a blank check for war. I urge you to persist in your efforts to expose and end this grotesque outrage.

Although such things as the debacle of southeast Asia tend to make me cynical about American foreign policy, I cannot really believe that the President and all his advisers and appointees are just plain stupid. I am forced to suspect that there is in fact some sinister intent underlying American policy and action. Is it possible that this historic home of democracy and justice is knowingly attempting to bring about the "final solution" to the human problem?

Both as a former Oregonian and as one who loves the good of which the United States is capable, I have long followed and admired your service in the Senate. Please accept by most sincere congratulations on proving again that the "Tiger in the Senate" is a man of vision and judgment.

Sincerely,

SCOTT BEACH.

SEASPORT, MAINE,  
August 12, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am thankful that we had two sane men in Congress who refused to betray the American people by granting the President the right to wage war, if, when, and where he chooses; the choice being made, of course, by his masters, the oil magnates.

It is unfortunate that said American oil magnates, who now have complete control of our Government, do not share your evaluation of human life. They would say that the whole people of another nation, or group of nations, are not worth 100 tons of oil. These oil magnates, insane with greed, have lost all sense of honor, morality, decency, and other values which distinguish a man from a rat. History does seem to repeat. Instead of one Caligula, we are ruled by several.

I do not believe the people want either Johnson or Goldwater. (A Hobson's choice.) This is an ideal time for a third party that would pledge to replace government by oil magnates by democratic rule. I nominate you.

Sincerely yours,

J. ERNEST BRYANT.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 11, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your good letter explaining about the Health Institute. I can always depend on you.

Right now I just want to assure you of my confidence and support in the stand you have taken on Vietnam. The situation has turned out as we might have expected, after the folly of going in there in the first place. That I deplore these developments is an understatement. I resent them. What happens now is anyone's guess.

Some time ago I heard and applauded your fine talk on this subject before the City Club.

Please accept my apologies for this poorly typed letter. It's warm today, and I don't seem to be up to my usual form.

With every kind wish.

Cordially,

ELIZABETH OLSEN.

P.S.—Thanks, also, for the always welcome news report.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 13, 1964.

DEAR SIR: I recently heard you state (via radio) that you felt very strongly that Senator WAYNE MORSE should be defeated for reelection by the people of Oregon. Your immediate reason was because of his recent stand (alone) on the crisis in the Orient.

Sir, I remember, and evidently you have forgotten, a few years ago, our Senator MORSE took a similar stand (alone again) regarding Castro in Cuba. Castro was a public hero at that time but as soon as his true nature began to show, MORSE had the courage to stand up and warn us. He was too late to save Cuba and even too late to save us from the effects but we did turn some weeks later.

Our Senator MORSE has the people's viewpoint in mind and so, therefore, is a wise politician in the proper place, at home. He is the world's worst politician in Washington, D.C. He refuses to take part in our massacre. He, once a year, makes a statement of his financial affairs, and has tried to make it a practice by all. He has been against the fantastic increases in salary which recently were handed out to congressional Members, Supreme Court judges, and most all other Government employees.

Again, I would like to suggest that before you say such things, you should put yourself in our position and take a closer look at the convictions of Senator MORSE.

Sincerely,

GLENN W. KENNY.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.,  
August 9, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE:

I was happy to read of your opposition to President Johnson's "Fight if We Must" resolution. I hope you will continue to fight against it. Please explain further to the people the great disadvantage of going to war and the other alternatives they may seek. The people of the United States do not want war, some are simply deluded by a heroic feeling but are not thinking ahead to the terrible consequences they may suffer.

I hope you are able to gain the support of other Senators and bring about disapproval of this resolution.

Sincerely an Oregon voter,

RAMONA WASSON.

19854

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 20

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 6, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Concerning south-east Asia, we agree with you completely. We are always so proud of you.

Just a word to let you know.

Yours very truly,

ELIZAFETH SHANE.  
WILLIAM V. SHANE.

MONMOUTH, OREG.,  
August 10, 1964.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to commend you for your refusal to support President Johnson's recent order to use armed force at the Gulf of Tonkin. Although I cannot pretend to know all the facts of the complex Vietnam war, I do think that resorting to a "hotter" war there is not the answer. If only it were politically possible to have a chat now and then with the Chinese Communists. So many things can be resolved by negotiation rather than force.

Congratulations on an outstanding political career, Senator Morse. You are one of Oregon's few sophisticated statesmen.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ROBIN STAAB.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 11, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Words cannot adequately express my admiration for your courageous voting, along with Senator EARNEST GRUNNING, of Alaska, against the President's resolution. History will vindicate your stand.

It should occur to our fellow Americans that it takes a mighty amount of conviction and truth on your part to be able to stand up against the massive weight of public propaganda and vote as you did. I wouldn't be surprised that a great many people in this country are aware that there is something rotten, and it isn't in Denmark, either. It is obvious that the present American policy of getting Asians to fight Asians makes it possible for our present policy to continue without appreciable public resistance. If American boys were dying in any numbers, we would probably see a lot of protest.

For some time now I've been listening to some of those hatemongers, like Dr. Carl McIntire, C. H. Burpo, and Stuart McBurney, who are all supposed to be ministers of the gospel, but who have a weird idea of what constitutes Christianity. Ir. McBurney (spelling may be wrong) operates out of Glendale, Calif., his Voice of Americanism; and he called you unspeakable on one of his recent programs. It is amazing how skeptical and cynical he is of anyone who chooses to make use of our civil liberties, but on the other hand, how naive in accepting Fascist ideas from whatever source, without question. I suppose it is too much to expect a reasonable amount of consistency from these types.

Sincerely,

NORDIN L. LARSON.

EUGENE, OREG.,  
August 11, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I will try to make this brief. You are a busy man.

First, how proud we are that we have a Senator that will stand up for what he knows is right. This goes for some of both parties.

That foreign aid bill—I would like to see some of them work for what they get. That is what I

South Vietnam: bring our boys home and let them see what they can do. Are we a wet nurse for all those places? We are paydollars out when many here could use the interest of 1 day of the dollars they get. More power to you and the Senator from Alaska.

I never heard anything more on my correspondence with you on the widows' railroad annuity being cut because of her social security. Will we get the big nickel raise for railroad annuity and social security? And when will we be able to earn for them \$1,200. Don't you think a few of us in the good old United States shouldn't be left out when the millions are being given away. Just a dime would help.

My very best wishes, Senator.

ESTHER DUNLOP.

SALEM, OREG.,  
August 9, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: After reading your informative article on Vietnam in the August Progressive, I felt a word of encouragement from a staunch supporter of yours was the least I could do.

It is regrettable that we have so few Congressmen and Senators who can see the handwriting on the wall and who have the courage to stand up and fight for the right. Old Fighting Bob LaFollett was such a man to fight the jack on world issues, and only God can give him his just rewards.

Let us have more such articles in the Progressive. This magazine has been in our household since 1911.

Your life will surely be an inspiration and your memory will ever remain a benediction, which is my hope and prayer.

JOHN J. MORITZ.

DANT & RUSSELL, INC.,  
Portland, Oreg.,  
August 14, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: Let me congratulate you on the success you have had on the foreign aid appropriation bill. True, you did not get 100 percent, but you did a wonderful job. It appears that you have saved the taxpayers over \$1 million per day and we should be forever grateful. A job well done.

In regard to your policy on southeast Asia, I do not yet get all of the picture. I do not think, however, that we should not be monkeying around in little halfhearted affairs. I think that we had better give a good look at events and possibilities before we enter, and not get ourselves involved in any "loss of face" propositions. If we are to be involved in anything we should make sure that we are right first, and then be prepared to give it all we have or stay clear out. I do not think that we can keep a little island of freedom in southeast Asia, we either have to protect it all or stay out.

Thanks again for what you have done.

Sincerely,

STANLEY BISHOPRICK.

EUGENE, OREG.,  
July 31, 1964.

HON. SENATOR MORSE,  
Senate Chamber,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have saved the enclosed clipping to send to you. This man, Glenn Bass, really tells it without any trimmings and covering up any issues. Now, no wonder the French gave up after 10 years of trying to win a war like that.

Mrs. Wendel and I are very much in accord with your views and continued fighting efforts to turn the whole unwholesome mess over to the United Nations.

What prompted us to get in there in the first place? We have no security problems

have plenty just 90 miles. That's where our efforts should be. Latin America, etc. Those Asian countries don't appreciate what we do for them anyway, so let's get the hell out of there. Who else can I write to so we can get more help for you in the fight for getting out of such a hopeless mess?

We receive your monthly reports from Washington, D.C. Thanks very much.

We now have two of our children in New York City in show "Biz" and will soon have a third one, Dave, on his way. He's been in San Francisco doing Shakespeare plays.

Who knows, someday we will be famous?

Our weather has been beautiful this July here in Eugene.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. WENDEL.

IN SAIGON—BUILDING BOSS TELLS OF TERROR

(By Joe Frazier, Register-Guard)

The bars in Saigon have bars on the windows, according to Glenn Ross. The reason: to stop terrorist bombs and grenades.

Ross, a construction foreman, recently returned from a 19-month stay in South Vietnam where he was in charge of building airfields and ammunition dumps for the Vietnamese.

Formerly of Ames, Iowa, Ross has spent the past 14 years abroad in Morocco, Iran, Afghanistan, and Vietnam working on construction projects. He was in Eugene last week staying at the home of relatives at 2145 Friendly.

"When the newspapers talk about lots of terrorism in Saigon, they are right, Ross said. Our machine shops were within 200 feet of that American ship that was blown up in the Saigon harbor. We heard of a kid who rode by on a bicycle and threw a bomb shaped like a loaf of bread into an Army jeep. The driver rolled out of the jeep and was not hurt when the bomb went off. Then he whipped out his pistol and shot the kid in the jaw."

Ross said at the airfield where he was working a grenade once rolled into a tent. "A Vietnamese laborer threw himself on the bomb, and was blown to bits. One American was killed by it as it was. If it had not been for that laborer four or five would have died."

Ross said he was never bothered personally, but "The roads between Saigon and Benhoa were lined with bamboo and brush so thick you could not see 6 feet into it," he said.

He said one battle was fought within 5 miles of the runway on which he was working. He said he could hear the planes, and even see them, especially when they went down.

"The South Vietnamese warn an airbase by loudspeaker when they are going to bomb it," Ross said. "This is done to give the civilian laborers a chance to get out of there. But I think the Vietcong leaves too, so they never kill many Communists."

Ross said as a civilian he was fairly safe if he obeyed the restrictions of the U.S. military officers in the area. "They did not have any authority over us, but the rules were for our own good, so we stuck by them," Ross said.

He said one of the biggest problems with the Vietnamese Army was that 90 percent of its members were Buddhist and didn't believe in killing anything, even a fly.

"In my free time, I would mostly just lie around and read. Some of the boys went fishing around Saigon, but it got pretty spooky, especially if they knew there were a lot of the Vietcong in the area."

"The only trouble was, you could not tell the good guys from the bad guys, because they all looked alike."

"At one training school the army ran, over there, the Vietnamese troops were being given ground training. When the day for graduation came, only about one-third of them showed up. The rest just sent notes

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19855

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

Thanking the Army for the ammunition and training, and went off to rejoin the Vietcong."

HILLSBORO, OREG.,  
August 10, 1964.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR FRIEND: I just must drop you a few lines to let you know how much I enjoy reading about you giving 'em hell as Truman used to say, to boil it down. I think you are an intellectual giant with the greatest courage. I have heard it said, what good does it do, to expose those greedy moves; I say what would it be if we didn't have one like you to expose these grafts.

If we, labor, wouldn't have fought in past years, labor conditions wouldn't be what they are now.

I was in a few battles; I know—I am 76 years old and retired. All I do now is study world affairs.

As I got it doped out, if nothing is done to curb greed there's little hope for civilization. Mr. MORSE, I don't want to burden you with a long letter, I just want to let you know, you're a man of "me own heart" as the trashmen would say.

I am with you till hell freezes over.

We need you for President.

JONATHAN HOFF.

EUGENE, OREG.,  
August 9, 1964.

My DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your stand on southeast Asia. I believe that you are right.

Sincerely,

R. MORRISON ORUM.

AUGUST 9, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I have been following your political career for several years both as a Republican and as a Democrat. And I am proud to say I have voted for you in both parties. I have been wholly in accord with you on the stands you have taken in the Senate, I am doubly so in the stand you are taking in regard to Vietnam. I can't see that we have any business over there only to protect the interests of a few capitalists. If they would treat those people over there as they should, they would not need our boys over there to protect them and their interests. It seems to me that every place we go we want to treat those people as inferiors. I will admit that some of those countries are far more backward than ours. But they still have sense enough to know when they are being mistreated. I am afraid that we are getting too many nations against us. Past history points out what happens to a nation that gets too arrogant. There is Germany, Franco Spain, Belgium, Italy, and even China. Have all gone way down. All mostly on account of arrogance. We are all powerful. We have seen those things happen in our time. So go right ahead WAYNE there is one 80-year-old Oregonian that is patting you right on the back.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT H. GOFF,  
Grants Pass, Oreg.

WARREN A. KADAS, MD.,  
SUTHERLIN, OREG.,  
August 9, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: First, let me say that for once I agree with a position you have taken. I feel that if the Vietnamese want to go Communist, let them. There is no reason we should become more involved there. I feel that war is the greatest catastrophe that can befall a nation (much worse than a depression, poverty or what have you). For us to lose men over there is ridiculous. If the Burmese, Indians, Pakistanis and Malays go Communist also, let them.

Now, as to the true reason for this letter. I was appalled when I heard over the radio one day that the House of Representatives had passed a bill which included physicians in the Social Security System. We, as a group, have consistently opposed our own inclusion in the system. I do not intend ever to retire. I enjoy my work. I have made provision, through life insurance, for my family in case of my early demise. I am sure most physicians feel the way I do. I do not want social security.

Sincerely,

W. A. KADAS, M.D.

SALEM, OREG.

Senator MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to commend you on your vote on the North Vietnam issue. Not only because I agree with your sentiments, but because you were almost alone in espousing an unpopular idea—at least with your constituents. Perhaps I am mistaken, but I believe you will find that the folks back home agree wholeheartedly with you that our soldiers—and money, belong at home. I have no quarrel with helping other nations to stand up on their own feet, but I do not believe any nation—my own included—can solve the problems of any other nation. Through the United Nations, we can sit down at the conference table, and iron out differences, learn the ways of these other nations, and, perhaps, teach them some of our ways. Specific projects can then be decided upon, and financed through the organization. Surely this is the best method of teaching the idea of democracy. I also believe that all nations should be invited to join the United Nations—not only those who believe as we do, but those who do not.

It seems to me that this money could well be spent in alleviating the unemployment problem of our own country—housing, educational facilities, recreation, to name a few much-needed projects. A goal reached of decent housing for all, and education for all who can benefit from it would go far in solving the unemployment problem, and, I believe, would give us such fringe benefits as less juvenile delinquency, race riots, better health, and higher national morale.

Sincerely,

RUTH C. ANDERSON.

AUGUST 10, 1964.

DEAR MR. MORSE: This is just a note to say that we appreciate your courage in making an "unpopular" comment about our actions in Vietnam. We are of the opinion that such conflicts are extremely dangerous in the world in which we live and that international peacemaking machinery needs to be strengthened so that it can deal more effectively in a peaceful way with such crisis.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. WILLIAM FOSTER.

AUGUST 6, 1964,  
Myrtle Point, Oreg.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your principled stand in opposing the use of military force in Asia without first taking the problems to the U.N.

It is unfortunate for the people in the United States and, indeed, in the whole world, that more of your colleagues do not have the knowledge of international law, the world vision of realizable goals and the real interest in people that you and Senator GRUENING have. It takes great vision and courage to do what you did. Any shortsighted foolish person can beat war drums. More power to you both.

Sincerely,

Mrs. C. H. SCHUDDAHOPF.

EUGENE, OREG.,  
August 9, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are to be commended upon your stand on Vietnam. I want you to relay my gratitude to Senator GRUENING for his stand, too.

By what moral reasoning can the United States act internationally like an "outlaw" and be in a position to criticize other nations for doing likewise? When Russia approaches anything of an unilateral action with Castro, our politicians get all worked up about how "aggressive" it is. I am sure that if war is avoided, it will not be because of America's sane and unemotional course of action. We act like a little boy at times.

Sometimes I get the feeling that our "civilian" Representatives and Senators want to evade their political responsibility by handling over such serious matters to the Pentagon or the President.

I plan to write Senator Maurine Solomon to find out just where she was during your 2-hour period of protest. She should resign and let the voters elect someone that is interested in the job.

Please continue to be a beacon light in the Senate. The country needs a voice in the wilderness.

Respectfully,

GEORGE W. ROMINE.

AUGUST 12, 1964.

The EDITOR'S MAILBAG,  
Eugene Register-Guard,  
Eugene, Oreg.

GENTLEMEN: I should like to go on record as wholeheartedly supporting Senator WAYNE MORSE's courageous stand on the Vietnam situation, as well as foreign aid.

Thank you.

Yours very truly,

C. DAN CHRISTENSEN.

Cc: Senator WAYNE MORSE, Washington, D.C.

MULTNOMAH MONTHLY MEETING,  
RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS  
(QUAKERS),  
Portland, Oreg., August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to express our debt of gratitude to you for your courage in speaking out on the Vietnam situation.

We fully realize that it is not always politically expedient to remain a firm minority in the light of political pressure at such times.

Our support of your views have been made known to the local newspaper editors as per the attached copy of our letter to each of them.

We affirm our faith that solutions to the southeast Asian problems can best be solved through the use of the United Nations and an ultimate neutralization of the area.

Sincerely,

PEACE AND SOCIAL SERVICE  
COMMITTEE,  
ESTHER RICHARDS,

Clerk.

ROBERT MORRIS SMITH,  
Chairman.

MULTNOMAH MONTHLY MEETING,  
RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS  
(QUAKERS),  
Portland, Oreg., August 7, 1964.

DEAR SIR: As Friends we wish to express our grave concern regarding the situation in South Vietnam—a situation particularly tragic to the Vietnamese people.

We urge the placing of the entire Vietnam situation before the United Nations and the withdrawal of U.S. military forces from this area of southeast Asia as soon as United Nations personnel can be assigned.

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1



19856

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 20

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

We strongly support and commend Oregon's Senator WAYNE MORSE for his forthright stand and his outspoken desire to correct this phase of U.S. foreign policy.

Likewise the Oregon State Democratic Platform Committee is to be commended for supporting the position of Senator MORSE.

As events of the past week have demonstrated we are fast approaching a point of no return. Immediate steps must be taken to neutralize this area of conflict.

Sincerely,

PEACE AND SOCIAL SERVICE  
COMMITTEE,

ESTHER RICHARDS,

Clerk.

ROBERT MORRIS SMITH,

Chairman.

CAVE JUNCTION, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just want to tell you that I admire your stand on the Vietnam affair. I believe you are right in every detail.

And I certainly think you are one honest politician to be able to stand up, alone, and fight for your belief.

I do not think that Johnson will win the November election unless he can scare up a war between now and then. I am a staunch Democrat, but I will do without voting before I will vote for him. I have never known of so many Democrats voting for a Republican as they plan to do this year.

I don't think they like Goldwater, I don't. But everyone wants a change from taxes, foreign aid, and too much Government power. They have had enough.

We all appreciate you and your ideals.

Sincerely,

Mrs. PANSY HALLOCK.

EUGENE, OREG.,

August 11, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wholeheartedly support your stand on Vietnam. It took tremendous courage to vote "No" on the President's resolution, and I thank you for upholding your convictions.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ELLEN HUBBE.

[From the Eugene Register-Guard, Aug. 10,  
1964]

BACKS MORSE

To the Editor:

It seems to me that Senators GRUENING and MORSE deserve our warmest applause for their sensible and forthright—indeed, in these days, courageous—stand on the recent Vietnam crisis. It is comforting to know that there are at least a few people in the U.S. Government who are not looking for the first chance they can find to run off half cocked to the barricades or the launching pad. With more people such as them we might have a little more objectivity and calm in this world, a little less of the apparently prevailing rage and frenzy.

HAROLD B. BARCLAY.

MOUNT ANGEL, OREG.,

August 9, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: No doubt by now you have received any number of communications in which you have been called all sorts of names because of your refusal to approve the President's action in Vietnam. When I first read of your stand on this issue I was reminded of a story I heard some years ago concerning you.

The story tells of one of the Senators who went to the President and asked that something be done about you; the President was told, "He's nothing but an ignorant s.o.b." The President is supposed to have replied,

"I know, but with so many of them in the country they're entitled to representation."

I supposed that if this is true I must be ranked among those whom you represent. I can truly say that I have always been proud to know that you represent me in the Senate—but never prouder than when I read of your stand on the joint resolution for which the President had asked.

I have just completed teaching a summer session class in Latin American history and in doing so have had to point out the numerous times that our country has been guilty of less than noble motives and of out-and-out aggression. Of course, one likes to think that these matters are items of history and that times have changed. Our actions in Vietnam, however, must give us pause.

Again, Senator, thank you for your stand on this question. I am sure that while politicians will blame you for it, the course of history will show that your courageous stand was in the right. I am proud of you. If I can ever be of any assistance to you here in Oregon please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely,

THOMAS P. SULLIVAN, Ph. D.

EUGENE, OREG.,

August 5, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your statement on Vietnam over TV today was the only spot of light in an extraordinarily depressing day. Where are the other sane minds? I know you say you do not care what other's views are, but I assume you don't mind hearing from someone who agrees with you. Blessings on you.

DAVID F. ABERLE.

AUGUST 6, 1964.

DEAR MR. MORSE: My husband and myself are in full agreement with your stand on South Vietnam crisis. It is to our sorrow that our "peaceful" Nation has to ignore the functions of the United Nations.

Sincerely,

MARY C. SCHELL.  
(Mrs. H. A.).

SEASIDE, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express to you my strong opposition to the bill giving President Johnson power to take "whatever action necessary" to "keep the peace" in southeast Asia. This bill is an insult to Congress, and passage of it would constitute a surrender of Congress' constitutional duty to evaluate, endorse, or block declarations of war.

Your condemnation of American bombing of North Vietnam as "excessive" is excellent. I hope you will continue your rather lonely habit of speaking the truth in Washington. I wish that there were 89 other Senators like you. Thanks.

MARILYN H. TOBEY.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

August 8, 1964.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Thank you so much for standing up and declaring yourself for all-clear-thinking Americans.

I have heard so many comments pro and con on whether the United States had the right to go in and bomb North Vietnam. I am no lawyer, but my reasoning is that we have a right to defend ourselves on the high seas, but not to retaliate by bombing the bases that these boats or ships came from unless we are in a declared war.

When I heard about the incident I was frankly shocked, and it flashed across my mind that this could be a political move. If it is then whoever conceived the idea has

no business to be in such a high position of authority.

All this, of course, I am making my own decisions on, on the assumptions that the news media are giving us correct and complete information.

This sort of action could cause us to get involved in another action such as we had in Korea only many times worse. As you know, we have heard a lot about extremism in the past few weeks. From where I sit it looks to me like this the most foolish wholehearted kind of extremism that we could have. I frankly was shocked when I heard that so many Members of Congress seemed to be so wholeheartedly in favor of it. If this is the kind of action that men who are supposed to be levelheaded leaders and are sent to Congress to make decisions for our great United States, then I think that we are sadly in need of a great change. If any great power can just go ahead and do as they please because they do have the power then why in the hell are we paying in so much money to the United Nations and Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and bodies such as these that are supposed to take action in situations such as this. Please don't think that I stand alone in my convictions on this action. I did not see him but I have heard so many people say that Secretary McNamara sure looked like a boy who had just found out how he could run a new toy, at the news conference when he announced the news about the bombings.

If I am wrong, Mr. MORSE, please set me straight, but as you know I have a son who is over there along with thousands of other sons who have to take the consequences of the irrational decisions of those in command. I don't know that any one man can change the course of things there in Congress but I do appreciate the fact that you have the guts to get up and speak out on your own ideas.

Thank you so much for your initiative and courage to speak out as a leader who has some good commonsense left.

Yours truly,

JERRY J. BELL.

PHOENIX MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE Co.,  
Portland, Oreg., August 8, 1964.

HON. WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I write hastily to thank you for your stand on Vietnam.

Most certainly the United Nations should be handling this situation.

Sincerely yours,

ROY A. GAGE.

SALEM, OREG.

We like your courageous stand on the current Vietnamese war.

Mr. and Mrs. J. W. BRASHER.

PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I appreciate your stand on Vietnam. I think you are very courageous in defending what you think to be right and best for the American people.

I think we are dead wrong and should have never got involved, but history can't be turned back.

Your friend,

LLOYD W. HEAD.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 8, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for speaking and voting against our military action in Vietnam.

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

I have long been unable to understand our entanglement—for no logical reason, with no announced goal, and with no hope for achieving any meaningful, worthy victory. I resent the financial drain and the loss of life, when we have matters at home requiring attention.

I admire your courage. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Mrs. GEORGE L. BAILEY.

EUGENE, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I approve of your stand on Vietnam and admire your courage in taking it. The prevailing feeling seems the other way, although I can't imagine how people can justify our interference there.

This is a matter for the U.N. We have broken a treaty by being there.

Mrs. GEORGE PRINCE.

P.S.—I enjoy your newsletter.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 8, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My sincere thanks and admiration for your courage is speaking out on our reprehensible policy in Vietnam. It is sorrowful to think that only two of our Senators and no Representatives are deeply informed on U.S. policy in Vietnam. Otherwise they could not have rubberstamped our mistaken deeds.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. DAUFORTH HOGGAN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 11, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

If possible please send, airmail, copy of your Friday's speech opposing resolution for support of present Vietnam policy. It was scarcely quoted here. We are working on printed leaflet excerpting your speeches for churches and organizations here and elsewhere. Will send copies of all we do.

CARL URNER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 9, 1964.

Hon. Senator MORSE:

May I say you are foremost and great indeed as for the stand on the Vietnam issue.

Yours truly,

SULO JUONI.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 10, 1964.

WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senator,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept my sincere congratulations on the position you have taken on the current North Vietnam crisis.

It is certainly a tragedy that you must stand practically alone in your attempts to introduce some honest inquiry in regard to the State Department-Pentagon prepared foreign policy issues that come before the Senate; though perhaps a nation that appears to be increasingly typified by mutton-headed apathy and cupidty and by cranky extremism is only getting the government it deserves.

However, as I'm sure your mailbag will testify, there are many people, at home and abroad, who are immensely grateful for your courage and humanity in going against the established grain in so many crucial matters. Posterity, if we are granted one, will tell.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK W. STOKELD.

ROCKAWAY, OREG.

August 11, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A few days after "Hiroshima Day," we write to congratulate you on your forthright and courageous stand. You were one of only two who had the human decency to vote against escalating the "dirty little war" in South Vietnam.

We thank you.

MARGARET and LEW LEVY.

For President—WAYNE MORSE, our dark horse.

LEWIS & CLARK COLLEGE,  
Portland, Oreg., August 9, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Merely a note indicating my rather violent agreement with your views toward foreign aid in general and concretely and toward our Vietnam policy.

If the purposes, the liberal purposes, foreign aid was initiated for aren't remotely being attained after some 15 years, it's past time for reevaluation. We evidently don't learn from experience; one wonders why not.

As for Vietnam, one can only ask, Why a deeper commitment? What conceivable great good is being pursued here? What is the ultimate objective of our policy—the physical destruction of Communist China? One wonders if most Americans have any idea precisely where Vietnam is and precisely what we're doing there and have done there. It all seems a blind alley which will painfully and at great cost have to be retraced someday for other alternatives.

Sincerely,

Dr. JOHN A. CRAMPTON,  
Associate Professor of Political Science.

EUGENE, OREG.,  
August 10, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am currently a graduate student at the University of Oregon; I did my undergraduate work at Reed, and I recall that, when you were running for President in 1960, there was a big sign in the commons which said simply: "MORSE—Courage."

At that time I thought the adjective "courage" was quite fitting, but never, in my opinion, has it been more justified than during the current crisis about Vietnam. To my mind, it takes real courage to stand for the rule of law rather than supranationalism, to state that keeping the peace does not require dangerous flirtation with nuclear war. And above all, it takes courage to say these things in the U.S. Senate, where the stakes are the highest, and the pressures to bend to the will of the majority are the greatest.

I know that I speak not only for myself, but for many other university students as well; we have a keen interest in this matter, since many of us would provide the "cannon fodder" in the event that the illegal "McNamara's war" escalates into the genocidal "McNamara's world war."

Let me close by reemphasizing my support for your fight against those who persist in waging a false war for a false democracy in a far land.

Sincerely yours,

GREGORY F. BACHELIS.

EUGENE, OREG.,  
August 10, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for having the courage to vote as your conscience dictates on the question of South Vietnam.

I feel that history and the true facts will vindicate the position that you and Senator GRUENING have taken.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY LEEPER  
Mrs. Robert Leeper.

EUGENE, OREG.,  
August 7, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The luminously sensible, and at the same time, most courageous and high-principled stand you took, almost alone, in the Vietnam situation, confirmed again my admiration and respect for you. I think you may be nearer the sentiments of the people—as you are certainly nearer their best interests—than those who voted to increase the tensions and escalate the possibility of war in southeast Asia. You keep alive the hope that U.S. policy may some day once again be animated by traditional American ideals, and play a worthier part in human affairs than it has played of late.

Keep up your battle for truth and sanity, for you have support, and will find more.

Wickes joins me in this; and in sending you personal regards and warmest best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN F. BEAL.

McMINNVILLE, OREG.,  
August 8, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In the past, as a Republican, I have disagreed with you on many of your actions, but in this matter of intervention in North Vietnam I am with you 100 percent and so are many others, although they are afraid to say so openly for fear of being branded unpatriotic. If this goes on, it can easily lead to a war we can't win and which will lead us to economic chaos. I applaud your courage in this very serious matter.

Sincerely yours,

CARL H. MALONE.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.,  
August 8, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senator,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I feel that the State of Oregon should be proud to have one Senator that has the backbone and fortitude to stand back of their or his convictions and opinions.

It appears that the most of our representatives in public office have been brainwashed and have no backbone or guts to stand up for what is right. But each night I thank the good Lord and ask Him to guide and protect our good Senator WAYNE MORSE. May the Lord bless you and your good family.

I remain,

Sincerely,

M. WALTER S. MILLER.

EUGENE, OREG.,  
August 7, 1964.

U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Hearty congratulations on your forthright and sensible Vietnam stand. I am only sorry you could not be the one who is opposing the Arizona aardvark in November. I have, incidentally, written to Huntley and Brinkley inquiring why they so completely ignored your remarks on this southeast Asia crisis, not that I expect a straight answer.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD B. BARCLAY,  
Assistant Professor of Anthropology,  
University of Oregon.

19858

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

August 20

(The following letter was sent to President Johnson on August 7, 1964.)

EUGENE, OREG.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am totally and completely opposed to your policies and decisions in regard to southeast Asia, and particularly in regard to the retaliatory strikes against North Vietnam.

1. You have overreached your constitutional authority by ordering an attack in an undeclared war. The declaration of war is the prerogative of Congress, as representatives of the people.

2. The presence of U.S. fighting ships in the proximity of North Vietnam and thousands of miles from these shores, even though in international waters, is unnecessary and provocative.

3. The presence of the United States in South Vietnam is a violation of the Geneva agreement, of international ethics, of American principles, of common sense, and a bypass of the United Nations.

4. The United States has demeaned itself in the eyes of the entire world. By retaliator, tough talk, and the mobilization of warships and troops in southeast Asia, we appear like a grizzly bear baring its teeth, unsheathing its claws, and growling in an effort to pick a fight with an ant. The disparity between the population and particularly between the economic and military power of North Vietnam and the United States makes the solemn and serious threats and pronouncements of the United States unutterably ridiculous.

5. The proximity of U.S. naval ships to North Vietnam has brought about this defeat in world prestige. By allowing ourselves to be attacked, we must either present the world the ridiculous spectacle of fighting this ant or running away from its bite.

6. We have abandoned the principles of freedom and self-determination which created this Nation and made it great. We are no longer great in motivation or principle, only in power. If this situation continues, it is the beginning of the end of this country as a great nation.

7. The extreme secrecy of the CIA and its involvement in affairs such as these make it an international conspiracy as obnoxious as international communism. I am fast developing as must distrust for the CIA and consequently for the news reports of foreign affairs and the pronouncements of this Government as I have for those of Communist nations.

8. International communism will be defeated by the implementation of superior principles, not by military power.

9. Enclosed in a copy of an address entitled "South Vietnam and United States Foreign Policy," which attempts to spell out such principles.

Sincerely,

CALL J. NELSON.

WALLOWA, OREG.,

August 8, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to tell you how much I admire your courageous and consistent stand against that dirty Vietnam war, for to my mind it is a dirty war if I have the straight of it.

Your calling the Government there a puppet of the United States and the impossibility of winning a conventional war in Asia seems true. And you rightfully denounce our going it alone and without U.N. sanction and without congressional debate and war declaration.

I read in the July 30, 1954, issue of the U.S. News & World Report the text of the 1954 Geneva Conference agreements, and the expressions of relief from different ones that the long war was over. I read what Eisenhower said, "as loyal members of the U.N., we also say that in compliance with the ob-

ligations and principles contained in article II of the U.N. Charter, the United States will not use force to disturb the settlement." Walter Bedell Smith, Under Secretary of State, said the same.

Mendes France: "Within a few days, and very rapidly in the main districts, blood will have ceased flowing and we will not have the poignant feeling that the youth of our country is being decimated there. It is the end of a nightmare." Anthony Eden: "A real gain for peace"; Nehru: "This is one of the outstanding achievements of the postwar era, and for the first time there will be no war anywhere in the world."

According to the agreements, as you doubtless know, the demarcation line between North and South Vietnam was a temporary line and not to be permanent. The two Vietnams were to be united under a single government by free elections in July 1956. Why did we not push for these free elections, I would like to know? No foreign powers were to intervene, no military bases by a foreign power, and no more than 685 military advisers.

I trust you will keep up the fight. Am sure there are a lot of people with you.

Yours respectfully,

DAVID SCOTT.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to express my appreciation for the stand you are taking against the war in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

MRS. SHARON MACKAY.

EUGENE, OREG.,

August 8, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,  
U.S. Senator From Oregon.

DEAR SIR: After listening to reports from all sources on happenings around the world and the way we are sticking our nose into things that are none of our business I can truthfully say: Thank God the State of Oregon has WAYNE L. MORSE.

Where do we go from here?

My history tells me that my own country has top rating as the worst aggressor, dating back to about the time the last of the signers of the Declaration of Independence had passed away.

The Mexican War was about the first move and stands out as the big plum of aggression of all time. This was before my time but since I have a perfect memory of the following happenings.

The rape of the Hawaiian Islands by the McKinley administration was one of the first after the turn of the century.

The Panama Canal deal by Theodore Roosevelt was the first time the U.S. Navy was used to back up a rotten steal against a helpless country.

The reputation of Admiral Dewey in the conquest of the Philippine Islands after the Spanish-American War was an insult to the civilized world.

The authorizing of slavery under the American flag by a President of the United States about 30 years after the Civil War. (This can be verified by congressional records.)

How many times the Marines have been sent into small countries to collect private bills of crooked private manipulators I have no way of telling but the proof is there for the looking. Here I will insert a quotation from one of our ex-Presidents: "History will have the duty to keep our shortcomings out of the history books."

In this election year we have no choice but to write in one's own name and put an X in front of it and hope for courage for right.

Yours truly,

GUY A. ROGERS.

PORTLAND, OREG.

August 7, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I suppose you (not for the first time) are feeling somewhat like a onetime Senator from Kansas who laid his political life on the line to vote against the impeachment of President Johnson the First: "I had the feeling of looking down into my political grave." And he was!

I hope it will be just a little bit of comfort to you to know that at least one insignificant person has been and still is with you all the way in this wholly unfortunate situation in Vietnam.

There is an eerie (unreal) air about this current brinkmanship, as if it had been arranged.

I realize this is no time for President Johnson the Second to be telling the American people the truth. He has an election to win. I hope the Chinese and the North Vietnamese understand this.

In view of the failure of the many members of United Nations to whoop it up for your idea of laying the whole matter in the lap of the U.N., it is reasonable to believe they understand the situation.

I have felt that this whole situation (rather than being aggression by the North Vietnamese and Chinese) is a civil-religious war in South Vietnam between the Catholics and the Buddhists. Apparently the so-called guerrilla forces are using U.S. weapons supplied by Buddhist boys who join the army to learn to use them, then go over the hill with all the weapons and ammunition they can carry away. Just what happened when the northern Chinese invaded China proper.

At any rate, I appreciate the fight you are giving the ruling military in this country. Time should prove you to be right, but it is difficult to get past the tight censorship of American news media which feel they have to go along with the pseudo patriotism of the moment.

With very highest regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

HERBERT L. FRYBACK.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Thank you for your definite stand on the Vietnam situation; you are not standing alone but you do have the courage to stay with your convictions.

I am sure all the facts have not been brought out. Adlai Stevenson only told our side of it. I feel sure there were provocations which caused them to fire on our aircraft carriers. Hope the other side gives their version of it. We even boasted of the amount of damage we did to them. I hope the U.N. demands a fair hearing. It looks to me like we wanted to get into a skirmish in order to provoke the Communist countries to show their hand.

I heard Bob McNamara on TV and he couldn't look the people in the face, but kept shifting his eyes everywhere else. I think it could be called his war.

I am old enough to remember the Spanish-American War, when we blamed Spain for the sinking of the battleship *Maine*, and went to war over it, only to find out later that it was sunk by an inside explosion, but it created enough bad feelings that many men lost their lives over this false accusation, and we succeeded in getting control over Cuba, which has turned into a bad headache for us.

It sort of irks me to hear them say they are fighting for a free country. What countries are free? Our hands are tied at every turn. The Negroes have waited for over 100 years for the freedom they were granted, and we can't build even a small house on

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1



our own property without getting permission.

I hope and pray that some good will come out of this U.N. discussion, and that we will have learned a good lesson.

Hope Senator GOLDWATER is defeated in November. I never saw anyone who could say so many things and then turn around and say he was misquoted.

Keep up your good work. We need many more like you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. EATA CALAHAN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

August 6, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Office Building of the Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree with you that our country shares responsibility for the incidents in the Tonkin Bay, and I congratulate you on your forthright statements these last days. Such candor is all too rare in American political life.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. HAMMOND.

EUGENE, OREG.,

August 6, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have little regard for politics, letters to editors, plugging elected officials, etc., but I feel that at this time, when you are representing yourself at the apex of your courageous, intelligent service, I must do more than content myself that I have always been a staunch supporter and vote caster for you.

For no other reason than to let you know that the small voices whom you represent so well, that is, those of us who rarely if ever write to editors, speak from soapboxes, or generally voice our inclinations other than at an election, are very proud of you at this moment as we always are when you respond to the need for intelligent, humane, devoted, and enlightened performance in the U.S. Senate.

Sorry for the verbosity, but I thought perhaps that you might find some comfort and delight in the unequivocal support of one of your constituents.

Most sincerely,

STEPHEN N. STIVERS.

SALEM, OREG.,

August 6, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: Many, many congratulations on your courageous stand. You are building a place for yourself in history. Your colleagues are digging their political graves.

I know when the people of Oregon understand the facts, you will have their united support.

I am writing some letters to the press and hope to get them published. Kindest regards and best wishes. Keep up the fight.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR H. BONE.

AUGUST 5, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your stand on the Vietnam situation is right, courageous, and honorable.

As you state, the aggression of North Vietnam should have been taken to the United Nations.

For a powerful military nation to have done so would have strengthened the peace-keeping machinery of the United Nations, and also have set a noble example of restraint

before the nations of the world, too prone to destroy each other.

Occasions like this make us feel proud of you as our Senator.

Most gratefully,

GEORGE J. CLAUS.

PORTLAND, OREG.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

Senator MORSE: Following Lyndon Johnson's statement on television Tuesday, I read the texts you kindly sent me of your speeches in the Senate April 24 and June 3 and of the speech to the City Club. Needless to say, I was impressed. Your arguments are more than convincing: they are compelling.

But what bothers me most, Senator, is the unstated question that necessarily lurks in any discussion of our policy in Vietnam. Why is the Government spending so much and violating so many agreements to pursue this war effort? I am a young man, Senator—I cast my first vote in your most recent campaign for office. But I have a degree in history from Harvard and like to think that I am neither soft-headed nor naive about politics. I am prepared to see, and do see, lying, cheating, injustice, and hypocrisy in the conduct of national affairs. But I am not prepared for and do not understand such massive and unredemmed stupidity as now prevades our Government. One can only, sadly, surmise that our leaders have been bullied by the opposition, and conned by the pictures of Life photographers into the present unworthy, undignified, and foolhardy policy of belligerence.

As, bewilderingly, Adlai Stevenson stammers into dishonor, you emerge, Senator, as the hero of the American left. One wishes one could offer more than a letter of approval and the promise of a vote; but please accept these.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR JOHN MOREY.

REDMOND, OREG.,

August 6, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We've often thanked God that we are represented in the U.S. Senate by an American in the best sense of what that word implies. A man who, like those in the days when our Government was being founded, stated his convictions and presented the logic on which they were based, and then stood steadfast with them. Regardless of the consequence.

Individuals with that kind of courage and integrity were able to establish the most successful and satisfactory system of government yet devised and so long as we have even some of them in public office we can have confidence that our institutions will remain safe.

The citizens of this Nation surely are not as stupid and blind as some people seem to think they are and if someone has the courage to keep presenting the truth, no matter how unpopular for awhile, then in due time the citizens will come to understand and exercise their power to effect correction.

In the present Vietnam affair you appear to have been cast in the inevitable role of "opposer" to a course of action that has popular appeal, but in pursuance of which, that fact that it is illegal, fraught with grave potential dangers, and deviates from rationality, has been disregarded.

We applaud your courage and assure you of our unqualified endorsement of the stand you have taken. It is not true that the majority is always right and sometimes the cause of the unpopular minority triumphs

because it is based on a concept of truth and commonsense that is eventually appreciated by enough people to make it effective.

What you said had to be said by someone and we are proud that it was our Senator who spoke.

Our friends, Dr. and Mrs. C. E. Stewart, 631 West Antler Avenue, Redmond, Oreg., join with us in commendation and approval.

May God bless and sustain you in this unhappy time.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD S. KNOWLES.

Mrs. DONALD KOWLES.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

August 5, 1964.

U.S. Senator W. L. MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I listened to your talks on television while back in our home State and have always realized how right you are. I hope you may have some great influence on Congress, because we stand a great chance of getting into another war. The great warmongers of our time, Johnson, Goldwater, and McNamara, Secretary of Defense, are just bound to get us in war. I am a World War I veteran and realize that our Spanish-American War was caused by hotheads and warmongers.

Sincerely,

D. W. SONNELAND.

THE DALLES, OREG.,

August 6, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MORSE: I have just read in the Oregonian the article saying "MORSE Attacks U.S. Action as Provocative."

Although we are Republicans, my family and I are behind you 100 percent in your Senate speech. That is just what we and many other Americans think.

We are thankful that we have a man of influence from Oregon in the Senate and a member of the Foreign Relations Committee that will tell us the truth.

Respectfully yours,

ELIZABETH SCHERRER VANDERSLICE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to tell you that I am completely in agreement with the position you have taken on Vietnam. I am proud to be your constituent.

You will be interested in knowing that not only are the members of my family behind you but at coffee yesterday all three of my coworkers were behind you. Thank you, Senator MORSE.

Yours truly,

ART LIND.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.,

August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Unbounded thanks to you for your stand against our operation in southeast Asia. God bless you. Keep up the fight until we withdraw our military from this foolhardy enterprise.

I enclose the letter which I have sent to President Johnson, and, with changes, several Senators.

Please let us know if we can strengthen your hands in any way.

Thank you, too, for your vote for cloture and fine support of the civil rights bill.

Sincerely and gratefully,

HARRIET YARROW.

19860

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

August 20

MALIBU, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KUCHEL: I send you my profound thanks for your vote for cloture on the 10th of June. We are grateful for your leadership in passing the civil rights bill.

Now may I have your assurance that you will challenge the President's policy in Vietnam instead of supporting it? Let us stop the shooting and call back our military from Vietnam. Our vague goals there can only lead us from tragedy to tragedy, if not larger catastrophe. We gain no friends abroad by this folly; no logic can justify the loss of another American or Vietnamese life. We can only lose power and security with each hour that we pour our dollars into this constantly worsening situation.

It is difficult to excuse irresponsibility in high office even in an election year. If Mr. Johnson consults GOLDWATER, we are lost indeed. This evening I searched with a sad heart in vain for your vote against our operation in southeast Asia. How can we send military equipment and personnel to Vietnam in violation of the Geneva Agreement of 1964, and abrogating our pledge of 1962, nay, our signature to the United Nations Charter. Then we hide behind the fact that our warships were a few miles outside of North Vietnam waters. How can we sponsor such foolhardiness as to believe that the world will be in love with us, or awed by us?

Why do you not stand for our withdrawal from our illegal position in Vietnam and the placing of the question in the hands of the United Nations, or a commission appointed by the United Nations?

Sincerely and respectfully,

HARRIET YARROW.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Heard your statement about South Vietnam.

Just a note to tell you we are with you.  
Best wishes.

Sincerely,

MISS LEE COVACH.

PORTLAND OREG.,  
August 8, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a note to express our appreciation for your courage on your stand about the Vietnam crisis.

We have for many years admired your independent thinking. Although it is difficult for us to determine the merits or demerits of a particular issue, it is reassuring to have men with your intelligence and courage judging them for us.

Sincerely,

MRS. DONALD LARKINS.

BEND, OREG.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On July 21, 1964, a letter which I had sent to the editor was printed in our local paper, the Bulletin. Enclosed is a copy.

Although recent developments have, I believe, strengthened the U.S. right to be in Vietnam, I still think the U.N. would be the best course for us to take.

When the United States found it necessary to bomb the coast of North Vietnam, President Johnson spoke to the American people on August 4 and our Ambassador to the United Nations spoke on August 5. If you have copies of these speeches, I would appreciate a copy.

I am also doing research on the history and purpose of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If you could send me some historical and statistical information about the RECORD, I would be thankful.

Please, also give your view on how well the RECORD forfills its purpose to the citizens of the United States.

I cannot afford to subscribe to the RECORD, but I enjoy looking at what copies I do receive.

I would like at this point to thank you for all the help you and your staff have given me in the past. I hope you are in the Senate for a good many more years.

Yours truly,

HAROLD C. MCLEAN.

VIETNAM SOLUTION PROPOSED BY WRITER  
TO THE EDITOR:

We have entered into a tragic and perilous war in South Vietnam.

In direct violation of our Constitution we have sent American servicemen to their deaths in a civil war which is not between two countries, which is often states, but between forces in one country.

But how can we attack the North Vietnam violations, when we are also breaking the agreements by giving South Vietnam direct military aid?

We must sweep our own back porch before we try to sweep North Vietnam's.

But even more tragically, at the same time we break the agreements by being in Vietnam, we are upholding the very articles of the Geneva agreements which limit our power to win the war in Asia.

These articles prohibit the introducing of military equipment other than what was already there in 1954.

How can we send our servicemen to their deaths without giving them the modern equipment they deserve?

We must uphold all of the agreements, thus strengthening our charges against North Vietnam.

If we withdraw from South Vietnam, thus upholding all of the Geneva agreements, we then can, with justice, take the whole matter to the United Nations.

The U.N. would take the necessary steps to insure world peace, possibly penalizing North Vietnam for their alleged violations of the 1954 agreements.

This is basically the stand which Senator MORSE has taken on this issue and I hope the rest of Congress joins with him.

Respectfully yours,

HAROLD MCLEAN.

BEND, OREG., July 14, 1964.

JACKSONVILLE, OREG.,  
August 6, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have just finished reading a recent book by Anna Louise Strong, "Cash and Violence in Laos and Vietnam." It gives a detailed account of the intrigue and atrocities we have been committing in the Indochina area. You seem to be pretty well informed but if you would read this little book we would be glad to send it to you. It is full of documented evidence which fairly makes one ashamed to admit being an American.

Words fail us in expressing our appreciation of your wisdom and courage in protest against such a policy.

We once expended some effort to make you our President. You have proved your greatness by being right instead of President.

Very sincerely,

BERT HARR.  
CHRISTINE HARR.

SCAPPOOSE, OREG.  
August 7, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Even if you stand alone in your fight against the resolution concerning the action in Vietnam, we want you to know that there are people here in Oregon who support your views and actions.

In all the years we have lived here there

has never been a time when we doubted your honesty, and I can't write that about any other political figure. I know expediency is after considered "good politics," but we need to be able to believe that at least one man means what he says.

I hope that faith and belief of people like us is of some comfort, when you receive criticism, or worse, for the courageous stand you have taken.

Thank you so much.

MOLLY MEULENELD.

SCAPPOOSE, OREG.

August 7, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you and support your stand on the resolution to support our Government's action in North Vietnam.

I hope that someday we, the public, get all the facts on these incidents as they seem to me to have come at a too opportune a time.

I and a number of people I have talked to wish to thank you for your steadfast position on southeast Asia. Please, do not change.

Respectfully,

TOM MEULENELD.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

August 6, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks for the news release on the bombardment by South Vietnamese of North Vietnamese islands. That enabled many thinking people to put the pieces together. I don't mean the editorial writers of the Oregonian or the Reporter, either. I mean honest-thinking people.

Another thanks for your veto vote on the administration's resolution for a predated declaration of war, as you properly put it. Obviously there are few constitutional liberals in sight back there on Capitol Hill, when the going gets a little rough. Both my wife's and my hat are off to you.

Sincerely,

JOHN METTAM.

ALBANY, OREG.,

August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR MR. MORSE: You are absolutely correct in the stand you have taken concerning Vietnam. From the very beginning—in Eisenhower's regime—this country should have been the responsibility of the United Nations. Now look at our situation. It must be very difficult for our friends in the U.N. to stand with us, knowing we began wrong originally.

Another thing: I am suspicious of this inertia between the Pacific Northwest and California. Is the private power pool to have precedence over public utilities—city, county, REA, etc.? Because if it is, I am absolutely opposed. Is the Government actually going to build its own line? If it doesn't, I am against the entire program. That will mean private power will run the dam output all over the West. It would be much better if the Government called all the shots. Much.

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA STAUBLE  
Mrs. F. J. Stauble.

THE METHODIST CHURCH,  
EBBERT MEMORIAL,  
Springfield, Oreg., August 5, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to tell you that I wholeheartedly back your stand that the United States ought to get out as a participant in the war in South Vietnam and that United Nations ought to be called upon to deal with this situation and to establish a peacekeeping force there.

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

I have read the information that recently came from your office giving your views on the foreign aid bill, and I must say again, I am behind you. I have long believed our country ought to do all it can to help others help themselves, but I certainly agree with you we ought to eliminate expenditures that are wasteful or that do not get results.

Sincerely,

ROSS KNOTTS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

Sir: Today's paper indicates that only you and Senator GRUENING, of Alaska, opposed blanket support of the Vietnam issue. Good for you. It took real courage to stand up and voice your opinions.

I believe you to be one of the very few worthwhile people over there in that town of Washington. Your detractors might well say, "Just another letter from an ardent blind supporter and yes-man". That is not the case since I have differed with your opinions on a number of issues. The fact remains, however, that we always know where you stand and that is what is important to me. So many officials have no backbone and simply vote with the mob. Principle means nothing to them.

Some of this group are naive enough to think that they can fool people indefinitely, but such is not the case. True, we need an adequate foreign policy and program, but why do we support so many unworthy cliches, causes, and individuals?

Once again, you have spoken your mind. Let the chips fall where they may.

Respectfully,

G. A. WHITEHEAD.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Recently I was fortunate enough to tune in KATU when you were being interviewed on foreign affairs by two young newspapermen.

I just wanted to let you know I enjoyed it thoroughly.

I also appreciate your letters and the copy of the foreign affairs speech recently received.

It is my firm belief that if we had more statesmen and less stooges in the House and the Senate this country of ours could be made a showplace for the rest of the world to look up to.

Sincerely yours,

W. G. RAYMOND.

P.S.—Just heard your short interview with CBS. More power to you.

EUGENE, OREG.,  
August 7, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As new Oregonians, we wish to express our admiration and appreciation of the forthright and courageous stand you have taken on the Vietnam crisis. Minority positions such as yours are very necessary to draw out more complete information on the United States' role in international affairs, since the various news media available to us fail, or are unable, to furnish enough information to enable the public to reach appropriate and sensible opinions. (Would that more of the elected refused the sheep's role.) Our endorsement and encouragement of your senatorial actions.

We would appreciate receiving any materials you may have on this and other national and local issues.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN and ALEA DE JUNG.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senator from Oregon,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

My DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The purpose of this letter is to thank you for your leadership and the stand that you have taken in the matter of foreign aid. I agree with your position completely. I am grateful that you have the intelligence and forthright courage to take such a stand.

And further, it is even more cause for thankfulness that you have taken the position reported in the press and radio in the crisis in Vietnam. It is cause for profound thankfulness that at least someone stands up to oppose a policy that is so likely to involve us ever deeper in an unfortunate foreign struggle, if it does not, indeed lead ultimately to a nuclear holocaust. I hope that you will keep up the lopsided endeavor to get this whole mess into the hands of the United Nations. Will we have to call on another Eisenhower to get us out of an Asian imbroglio? Surely Senator GOLDWATER would not do us much good. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

C. V. GUSTAFSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am very proud to be represented by a man intelligent enough to see the Vietnam situation as it really is—and brave enough to stand up and be counted in a highly emotional situation.

Yours sincerely,

ELEANOR KAFOURY.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
July 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I never thought the day would come when I would be writing a letter commending you. If this startles you a little, you must bear in mind that in 1956 I was executive director of the Republican State Central Committee, spent hours helping to research and write "Let's Look at the Issues, Senator Morse" and wound up as Doug McKay's campaign manager.

In any event, Senator MORSE, I want to congratulate you on two positions you have taken. First on your stand concerning our country's position in Vietnam. Second on your recent vote concerning the disclosure of income of elected officials.

And while I am at it, I might as well add a third (and this might disclose how long I have been begrudgingly seeing your good points). I want to commend you for your denunciation of the consumption of alcoholic beverages in our legislative buildings. It is just as wrong to allow drinking there as it is to allow drinking in the trust department of our bank. I am not a "blue nose" and will drink with the best of them but I agree with you on this matter.

Yours truly,

DOUGLAS P. HUEGLI.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 7, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am extremely interested in your views on the current Southeast Asia situation. Could you please send me some information which explains your position on our policy there, or direct me to sources which accurately report your position in detail. Also, could you recommend any news publications which you think present a nonpartisan view of the situation. I am most interested in your interpretation

of our purpose in Vietnam and in your statement regarding the events which directly preceded the North Vietnamese attack on our ships. Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

J. RODGER BERNARD.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 5, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Just a line to express approval and support of your position in regard to Vietnam.

I heard you at the City Club and approved your position as did many other members. Keep up the fight.

Sincerely,

HOWARD H. VAN NICE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I heartily agree with your views on the Vietnam situation and do hope you do all in your power to kill the resolution in Congress whereby the President is given the power to interfere in Vietnam and other countries with military intent.

Keep up the good work and try to get enough support to kill this unconstitutional resolution.

Yours respectfully,

ALICE HEDGPETH.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 6, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have always agreed with you that we should pull out of South Vietnam and put the whole problem into the hands of the United Nations.

Now, having just finished reading the new book, "The Invisible Government," and in view of recent developments, I am all the more convinced that we should get out of southeast Asia before the CIA gets us in any deeper.

I hope those "cloakroom Senators" that you mentioned on TV last night will have the courage to join you openly in your objection to the resolution.

Sincerely yours,

CLARA J. DAVIS  
Mrs. Leslie C. Davis.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 5, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heartily back your stand on Vietnam. Please continue to bring your point of view to the attention of the American public.

Sincerely,

JUDITH BOGGS.

CLATSKANIE, OREG.,  
August 6, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

Hon. MORSE: We been getting your reports. It is nice to hear from Government's activity on what is been done for our country, at this time, seems we are at war with someone in Far East. If we have interest in there, why can be settled peaceably, and stop killing boys.

Mr. MORSE, do your best to stop this war, and correct our economy at home, so people will have better understanding at home. Most States. Coming people are on relief, how long? To be at such ordeal, or we all become surplus, cannot see, or cannot understand from our leaders' standpoint.

Again, we say stop the war, please.

Yours truly,

GEORGE MINKOFF.

19862

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

August 20

AMERICAN PIPE & CONSTRUCTION  
Co., NORTHWEST DIVISION,  
Portland, Oreg., August 6, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE M. MORSE,  
U.S. Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your statement regarding our activities in Vietnam reflects my opinion exactly. Congratulations.

Your continued opposition to an administration policy which appears determined to involve us in a senseless Asian conflict is most appreciated.

Keep up the good work.

With best regards.

Very truly yours,

DEAN H. MITCHELL,  
Controller.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 6, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senator from Oregon,  
U.S. Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You stand on Vietnam as to be commended. You have expressed my views 100 percent. Keep up the good work. When the time comes, if ever, that the United States takes a slightly different tack on foreign relations, I am sure our position as a world power will be restored.

With best regards from a fellow Democrat and constituent.

Sincerely,

ICLA MCINTYRE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 4, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A few nights ago I saw you on the "Insight" program. I believe you made a very informative and valuable presentation. Some of the points you presented should be developed further.

You brought out the point that the United States is presently violating certain articles of the United Nations charter.

I believe that we are a great country. An essential factor of greatness is goodness. Goodness involves, among other things, morality and respect for the law. Law based on moral principles must be obeyed, not just when it is easy, convenient, or suits our purposes to obey the law, but all the time.

A country can be powerful without being great. A country must be good to be great.

We stated in our Declaration of Independence that we wanted the world to know why we believed in what we were doing in framing that document. I think the phrase "a decent respect for the opinion of mankind" is included in the Declaration of Independence.

In other words, world public opinion is important; that decent respect of the world is important. Senator GOLDWATER seems to think that we should not care a bit about world opinion. This is a big mistake on his part.

We cannot rely on world public opinion to make our foreign policy, but world public opinion is important, and must always be considered.

We must take all threats to the peace to the United Nations. The point is not whether the United Nations can or will do anything about a particular threat. The point is that the United Nations is the body designed for handling world threats.

Many people are willing to have other people bring their problems to the United Nations, or they are willing to bring problems to the United Nations if they are stuck with a problem they cannot handle, or if they want to delay taking immediate action on a problem.

We should not bring problems that involve the peace of the world to the United Nations only when it is easy or convenient.

to do so. We should do this every time a threat to world peace arises.

I believe that the reason we have not taken the Vietnam problem to SEATO and the United Nations is due to the fact that we are emotionally blocked by semantics. We are emotionally locked in (semantically) on Vietnam.

Let me give you some examples, and I am certain you could provide a dozen more.

If a Member of Congress argues with President Johnson on our policy in South Vietnam he is undercutting the President, and undermining our foreign policy.

If he persists, he is uninformed in regard to the facts, and the administration has more knowledge, possesses all the facts, and is better able to decide the issue.

If he does not wish to extend the war, he is "soft"; if he wishes to change our policy he is guilty of appeasement; or he wishes to neutralize the area and surrender to communism. Neutralization is becoming a dirty word.

Frankly, if our case is as strong as President Johnson says it is, we should be eager to use SEATO and the United Nations to help solve this problem.

The trouble is that we are now using certain emotional words that are actually reason destroying words.

Once we can escape our fear of certain words, we can more intelligently handle our foreign problems.

Sincerely,

ROBERT PARNAS.

ENGINEERING & SALES Co.,  
Portland, Oreg.,  
August 5, 1964.

In re Vietnam.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my complete support of your position on Vietnam.

I was amazed to hear Johnson's war proclamation and regret very much that the American Government will honor an aggressive militaristic attack. The pretext in which no casualties or damage was inflicted sounds ridiculous. The enormous extent of the retaliatory attack leads us to believe American military either promoted, agitated for, or welcomed the so-called attack.

It appears that this is a method of salvaging the South Vietnam Government past the November election.

Sincerely yours,

CARL G. SANTESSON.

SALEM, OREG.,  
August 6, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In my opinion your position on the present crisis in Asia is the correct one. I agree with you absolutely.

You are one of the few informed people of our times who has the courage to dissent. God bless you.

Sincerely,

JAMES LARSEN.

SALEM, OREG.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

We are 100 percent behind you in your stand on Vietnam.

Very best wishes.

GILES C. SMITH.

SALEM, OREG.,  
August 6, 1964.

U.S. Senator WAYNE MORRIS,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I fully support your position that the United States is the provocateur in South Vietnam and that you will not support a "predicated declaration of war" in Asia. I fully support your position as

stated in this morning's Oregon Statesman, Thursday, August 6.

Respectfully yours,

VERN NELSON.

GRANTS PASS, OREG.,  
August 6, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: It is good to know there is one voice of sanity in the current war situation. It is my modest opinion that Johnson wants war in an election year. This war would be extremely popular. People have gone utterly mad.

If war is declared, about the only one I will vote for is you. You seem to be the only one that knows what's going on.

Yours truly,

I. HEYER.

FOREST GROVE, OREG.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to thank you for your valiant stand against the warmongers in Washington. Voice the antiwar people is the cry from so many peace-loving citizens.

We have no business over there—just intruders; no reason only to protect some big oil business or the Catholic Church, and to make votes for Johnson. Too bad that our Government should neglect important things at home and risk the lives of millions in a third war.

We read your great effort before Congress to set them right. Thanks that we have someone there to champion what is right. God strengthen your hand.

Kindest regards and God's blessing.

THOMAS MORGAN.

SPRINGFIELD, OREG.,  
August 4, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just finished reading your article in the Reporter regarding former French Indochina. I also take the Nation. You have also written some good articles for it. I am proud of you, WAYNE, and always pass the papers on, but it is surprising how few people are interested in what our Congressmen are doing. Chas. Sauler, you, and I had a nice visit together while eating lunch together. I am sorry to tell you that Mrs. Sales died suddenly and we buried her a week ago. Beans and cherries need to be picked but it rains some every 24 hours. I think Bob Strank's prospects are good.

This is it for this time. Kindest regards to Mrs. Morse and the rest of the family.

Sincerely your friend,

JOHN H. STRUBE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 4, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Having followed your debate with Senator COOPER, having read your article in August Progressive, I cannot but admire your courage in presenting so many facts on the question in an election year.

Of course you were right in spite of the mighty armament interests and our Government's foolish involvement in such a mess. Our present policy seems to feel obligated to pursue the policies of Dulles, who knew little of the dangers. This was the grave mistake.

Now to be elected for any office from dog-catcher to President it seems necessary to bring out the old paranoid prop (fight communism), and you qualify on that score. Reason, United Nations, SEATO, and the Geneva accord are forgotten.

I am glad you are on the record in opposition to this departure in foreign policy. Your effort was superb but I doubt the administration will have the nerve to stop, look or listen during the campaign.

Felix Green's book on China engaged my keen interest and convinced me that China is on the make and that the West has in-

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

1964  
Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

dicted great injury on that country as his-tory shows.

With kind regards and best of wishes.

Sincerely,

WALLACE A. PRATT.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

July 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: How many more American youths are to be sacrificed in a way with no chance of victory, a war with little support and much opposition from the people being "defended," a war that for U.S. soldiers hasn't even a name?

The people of southeast Asia have an indelible resentment of Western involvement in their affairs, a resentment acquired over decades of foreign rule. No military campaign lacking genuine support of the people has the slightest chance of success, regardless of how many dollars are siphoned from the rank-and-file American taxpayer to finance it. This has been amply demonstrated, of course, by the bankruptcy and collapse of French military involvement in Indochina.

If for no other reason, the cynical pronouncement made July 28 by Premier Khanh that he will send U.S. arms and men where he sees fit, in defiance of administration policy, should force us to withhold this extravagant assistance.

What "national interest" can possibly be served by continuing to invest potentially creative lives and vast amounts of money in a government which cannot rally the support of the population it purports to rule? The investment would be more to the point here at home, where many millions still lack the decent material conditions prerequisite to true freedom.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN P. VAN HYNING.

SALEM, OREG.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have read in the American Legion magazine for August the arguments in "Pro & Con": Should U.S. troops be withdrawn from Vietnam?

In my opinion the Federal Government should withdraw our troops from Vietnam.

If the people in Vietnam prefer communism, let them have it. If all of Asia goes Communist, let it go. Can't we buy the products we need from that part of the world and sell to them what they need from us? That would stimulate trade and save our boys' lives.

MICHAEL G. PANEK.

HEPPNER, OREG.,

July 28, 1964.

WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senator,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I received your last report today and read every word of it, and it was wonderful; you are doing a marvelous job for the United States and your powerful brain is continually at work to cut down the enormous waste of unnecessary expenditures.

I will not write a long letter as I realize the thousands of letters you receive and have to answer, but I did want to let you know that I agree with you in many things you are fighting for and especially Vietnam, where we have wasted over a billion dollars and lost so many of our boys and what have we gained except waste of our taxpayers' money and loss of face, if we did drive Red China out of Vietnam as soon as we withdrew our troops Red China would be right back in Vietnam again just like Khrushchev was right

back in Cuba again as soon as the blockade was removed.

Now, please take care of yourself and get plenty of rest as our bodies have a limit for work and we need you so bad, we do not want anything to happen to you.

With very best regards and wishes, I remain,

Yours very truly,

ARCHIE D. McMURDO, M.D.

GOLDSMITH, SIEGEL & GOLDSMITH,

PORTLAND, OREG.,

July 22, 1964.

Re southeast Asia policy.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

U.S. Senator,

Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Even before your historic address before the Portland City Club I had noted with approval your point of view opposing the unilateral action of our country in South Vietnam.

Your address before the City Club was as carefully reasoned and supported by authority as the best arguments before the Supreme Court.

What logical answer can either Secretary Rusk or Secretary of Defense McNamara make to your position?

Has there been introduced any bill in the Senate to terminate our unilateral action in southeast Asia, or requesting that United Nations undertake the burden? Possibly you could generate some action in the Foreign Relations Committee itself looking toward such an end.

In any event, be the Paul Revere warning this country of the terrible debacle we are getting into in southeast Asia. At least in Korea there was the backing of the United Nations, whereas in the Vietnam situation our allies apparently believe, and probably correctly so, that this is a matter for the people of southeast Asia themselves to work out.

Cordially yours,

ARTHUR A. GOLDSMITH.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

August 8, 1964.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Today's Oregonian carried the sad news of congressional endorsement of Vietnam policy. The one bright spot in the story is of your courage to vote "no."

Your general position on our involvement in Vietnam has been sound from the beginning, and is yet.

So I thank you for truly representing my conviction (and for helping to form my conviction in the matter, too, I'm sure). Patriotism is not proven by emotional adherence to any official policy, but by courage to seek the real values even when they fly in the face of official or popular values.

More power to you.

Sincerely,

VERNON E. ROSS, Jr.

P.S.—I discovered Thursday evening that all my peace-minded friends have similarly rejoiced in your stand. I hope some write you.

R.

[From the U.S. Farm News, February 1964]  
IS THE UNITED STATES MAKING WAR ON THE  
VIETNAMESE PEOPLE?

(By Hugh B. Hester)

The violent attacks of the Diem government upon the Buddhists were helpful in one respect. These attacks enabled the people of the United States to see for the first time the cruel, corrupt, and vile character of the government which the leaders of the United States had placed in power in South Vietnam. This information, many believe, was made available to the people only because the rulers of the United States became convinced that the Diem regime could not

win the war against the Vietnamese people and therefore had to be replaced. In addition, Diem and his brother Nhu, unfortunately for themselves and families, made the fatal mistake of getting in touch with the Communist leaders in Hanoi, North Vietnam. (See New York Times, Nov. 8, 1963, and John M. Swomley's article, "The Vietnam Revolt," "Fellowship of Reconciliation," November issue, 1963, New York, N.Y., Box 271.)

This was a "traitorous" act under the Acheson-Dulles doctrine of world domination, euphemistically called Communist containment. The immediate results were (1) President Diem was murdered; (2) the Diem regime destroyed; (3) the CIA gained another Pyrrhic victory; (4) U.S. international prestige was further lowered, and finally, a golden opportunity was lost to stop the senseless slaughter of the Vietnamese people.

The assassination of Diem and his brother Nhu, therefore, accomplished nothing of value. The military junta, "free" world style, immediately took over and the usual diplomatic recognition promptly followed. Other probable results are: (1) The war against the Vietnamese will go on as formerly; (2) the usual starvation, torture, and murder of the little people of this small and defenseless country will continue; and finally, the U.S. Government will go on fighting and financing this undeclared war against a people whose only "crime" is a desire for peace, national unification, and independence of outside interference.

The U.S. Government has financed this war for the past 18 postwar years: 9 years for the French Government (a government which Churchill and Truman insisted be returned to Indochina at the end of World War II against the earlier advice of Roosevelt). And since 1954 for reasons which the U.S. "leaders" have never fully explained to their own people.

Was it not the U.S. Government, under the control of John Foster Dulles and his crowd, that repudiated the 1954 Geneva Convention in violation of a Dulles pledge: a pledge given at the time, in the name of the U.S. Government, not to interfere with its provisions? Had the provisions of this convention been fully implemented, no Buddhist monk would have found it proper to commit suicide; the peasants would not have been placed in concentration camps, euphemistically called strategic villages; the crops of the people, the foliage and forests of the nation would not have been destroyed or denuded by U.S. chemicals; and no Vietnamese man, woman, or child would have been "fried" by U.S. napalm bombs, dropped by pilots trained and directed by U.S. servicemen.

Was it not Dulles and his crowd, therefore, who prevented the unification of Vietnam, 1956, through free elections as provided for at Geneva, 1954? And was it not Dulles and his crowd that brought the brutal, cruel, and ruthless gangster group of Diem to power in South Vietnam? So long as the Diem regime confined its barbarous methods to the torture and murder of the "godless" opponent, the Vietcong, apparently no pangs of conscience troubled Mr. Dulles.

For once it became possible to label the opponent a Communist and make it stick, nothing else mattered. He then became an outlaw and outcast. He no longer belonged to the family of man. This dehumanizing of people, of course, has always been the objective of the directors of cold wars, whatever the race, color, or creed, or the time and place in history. First make a monster of the opponent, and then his murder became honorable, free from "Christian" conscience. In the First World War it was praiseworthy and honorable for Americans to kill Germans because the Germans were "Huns." In the Second World War it was lawful and laudable for the German "Huns" to murder millions



of innocent men, women, and children, first because they were Jews and later because they were Jews, Poles, Russians, French, Norwegians, and/or Communists, all members of "inferior" races.

And so it is now in South Vietnam. The brutality of our ally in this basically civil war has been dramatically revealed and documented by the distinguished Australian war correspondent, Wilfred G. Burchett, in his latest book, "The Furtive War: The United States in Vietnam and Laos," recently published in New York by International Publishers. (Price \$3.95.) Even much worse than the U.S. Government's support of this monstrous regime has been U.S. planning of the concentration camps, euphemistically called strategic villages, under the direction of Dr. Eugene Staley, the denuding of the forests, the destruction of crops, the killing of birds and animals and even people with U.S. chemicals, again under the direction of the U.S. military forces. All of these are recorded and documented by the author. In this book, in condensed form, for the first time, the U.S. reading public has access to the plots, counterplots, intrigues, and Machiavellian-like maneuvers of its Government in southeast Asia.

This writer, in a short article in Liberation magazine, June-July issue, 1961, quoted from Joseph Alsop's column, "Matter of Fact," New York Herald Tribune, September 9, 1959, to show how the U.S. Government plotted the overthrow of the neutralist government of Laos in 1958, and was planning its overthrow again in 1960. In the same article he quoted the British writer, Graham Greene, London Times, January 6, 1961, who reported, "Nobody with any knowledge of Laos is likely to deny that Prince Savanna's government has been undermined by the aid given by the United States to the rightwing forces," and continued, "In four winters in Vietnam I was an unhappy witness to the disintegration caused by the intrigue of the American underground agencies." Jack Raymond (New York Times, January 9, 1961), gives an even more bizarre account of American meddling. Under the headline, "U.S. General Runs Quiet Laos Team," he wrote, "Whatever success the Laotian Government has scored in battles with pro-Communist Pathet Lao forces can be attributed in large part to effective training by a special U.S. unit, headed by a colorful West Pointer nicknamed 'the Prussian.'" "The Prussian" was U.S. Brig. Gen. John Arnold Heniges, a German by birth, then on loan to the CIA. Later, according to the Associated Press, April 21, 1961, "the Prussian" and the members of his unit were put into U.S. Army uniform.

All through this period the U.S. mass information media were reporting that only the Communists: Red China and North Vietnam, were violating the Geneva Convention of 1954, which had been established to end the Indochinese war. A United Nations investigation team found these charges false, but it failed as usual to report the illegal activities of the U.S. Government noted by Graham Greene, Joseph Alsop, Jack Raymond, and the Associated Press.

Throughout much of 1962 the U.S. mass information media again charged Laotian Reds, the Pathet Lao, with violations of the 1961 cease-fire agreement. Author Burchett explodes this by quoting from a dispatch of the London Times Washington correspondent, May 24, 1962, to the effect that the U.S. CIA was responsible for the cease-fire breach, not the Pathet Lao. The dispatch stated, "The CIA provided the (Gen. Phoumi Novassan and his forces) with funds from their capacious budget \* \* \*." It is apparently not uncommon at all for the department of the sovereign state to pronounce a public policy for propaganda purposes, while using another department as a cover to carry out its real policy. In this case the CIA was

actually making policy and it is highly improbable that it was not doing so with the approval of the Commander in Chief, President Kennedy, if not under his direct orders.

Hugh Deane, a distinguished U.S. citizen and writer, places the responsibility for what is now happening in southeast Asia quite bluntly in these words: "The events that led directly to the war in South Vietnam began in 1954, and the decision primarily responsible for them was made in Washington." In this small pamphlet, "The War in Vietnam," (a Monthly Review Press publication, New York, N.Y., 50 cents per copy) Author Deane confirms as much of what Burchett recorded in "The Furtive War: The United States in Vietnam and Laos," as space permitted.

In the August 10, 1963, issue of the Nation magazine, Helen B. Lamb (a former economic analyst for the Center for Economic Studies, MIT) reports: "The exiles (in Paris) all give the same answer as to how the rebellion in South Vietnam started. It was triggered, they said, not by the machinations of North Vietnam, but by the peasants themselves, reacting to the savage, repressive acts of Diem's army." She continued: "The exiles are unanimously horrified by America's military conduct of the war (such as) destroying crops by poisonous chemicals, forcing people to live in strategic camps (called concentration camps by the exiles), and burning whole villages as revenge for harboring a single Vietcong guerrilla."

All the sources this writer has been able to discover confirm the report of the "Paris Exiles" that the South Vietnamese rebellion was triggered by the Diem regime and its murderous measures made possible only by U.S. support and often at U.S. direction. Most of the South Vietnamese problems clearly bear the trademark "Made in the United States." Even if the cruel crimes committed by this authoritarian, inhuman, and tyrannical regime were not participated in by U.S. military and civilian forces, as some clearly are now, the massive material and military support given it would make the U.S. Government a party to these crimes. The Diem regime could not have committed these crimes without support. No one has ever proven that Adolf Hitler personally murdered anyone, but he made it possible for the murder of millions.

Unfortunately, the average U.S. citizen knows little or nothing about these things. Why? Largely because his press, radio, and television commentators and his Government have not deemed it prudent to fully and truthfully inform him. They are afraid he would, like the "Paris Exiles" be horrified by the inhuman acts of his Government. They are afraid to let U.S. citizens know the truth about Government activities. Is this not why the U.S. Government permits only its chosen agents to travel to Albania, China, Cuba, North Korea, and South Vietnam?

The problems of Vietnam, like the other divided states and the underdeveloped areas generally cannot be solved by the United States or any of the other big powers. They can only be solved by the people directly involved. This presupposes, however, non-interference in the affairs of other nations and people by the big powers. It assures also the free exercise of the right of self-determination as proclaimed for all, but usually denied the small- and medium-sized nations.

Mr. John Foster Dulles, then U.S. Secretary of State, quite frankly and openly repudiated the principle itself—determination in a speech before the Overseas Press Club, March 29, 1954, when he said, "Under conditions of today the imposition on southeast Asia of the political system of Communist Russia and its Chinese Communist ally, by whatever means, would be a great threat" ("On the Brink," p. 66, by Davis and Hester, a Lyle Stuart publication, New York, N.Y.).

This statement of U.S. foreign policy has never been charged or repudiated by the U.S. Government.

The people in the underdeveloped areas, of course, need economic assistance from anyone capable of giving it, but this should be supplied through the United Nations and under its direction. One of the greatest blunders of the Truman administration, notable primarily for its blunders, was the destruction of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. UNRRA, as it was commonly known, was truly universal in scope, based on real need, non-charitable, as all nations contributed proportionately to their abilities, and it was nonpolitical in character. Aid designed for political purposes is worse than no aid at all. This is so because it is usually military in character, and this either promotes war or prevents necessary change. The latter in turn makes revolution necessary in order to achieve economic freedom from oppression. Any objective analysis of U.S. postwar aid will clearly show this.

The problem of Vietnam belongs in the United Nations, with the full participation of its own people and neighboring states which are not members of that world organization. The U.S. Government cannot solve the Vietnam problem even though it is now probably at the peak of its power. The U.S. Government cannot rule the world, and its rulers should abandon the attempt to do so; nor can any other government or group of governments, and they, too, should abandon the ideas. The world is too large, its people too diverse, and its needs too complex for this. International cooperation must replace force, if we are to survive.

The failure of U.S. leaders to recognize this basic fact is primarily responsible for their difficulties in China, Cuba, Germany, Korea, and elsewhere. Mr. Kennedy put the South Vietnamese situation quite neatly in his Senate speech, April 8, 1964, when he stated, "I am frankly of the opinion that no amount of American assistance in Indochina can conquer an enemy which is everywhere and at the same time nowhere \* \* \*." For the United States to intervene unilaterally and send troops into the most difficult terrain in the world \* \* \* would mean that we would face a situation which would be more difficult than even that which we encountered in Korea."

Now is the time for President Johnson to apply the wisdom of Senator KENNEDY's Senate speech. Now is the time for him to repudiate once and for all time the paranoid policies of Dean Acheson and the late John Foster Dulles. Fortunately for him, General de Gaulle has suggested an honorable way out: Get the United States out of South Vietnam as he got the French out of Algeria. And he should do it now.

Even the conservative New York Times states, "President de Gaulle's proposal to neutralize the Indochina states is neither new, radical or unthinkable, despite the current public hostility of Washington and Saigon." (New York Times editorial, Feb. 1, 1964).

And Mr. Walter Lippmann, certainly not a Chinese apologist, has this to say on the same subject, "In southeast Asia we have bolted the door and do not have that indispensable part of any sound strategy, a fallback position. This is where General de Gaulle is in fact rendering us a signal service. He is opening the door to the possibility that southeast Asia can be saved from Chinese conquest by political development which can be stimulated by any diplomatic bargaining which can be undertaken" (New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 4, 1964).

The Maginot-minded people in the U.S. Department of State, the Pentagon, and much of the U.S. power elite, it seems to this writer, make the fundamental mistake of assuming that the character of so-called communism is changeless and its nature neces-

sarily monolithic. No myth in ancient or current history is more insupportable; more untenable, or more absurd than this parochial concept of today's world.

Nevertheless the U.S. Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, reported to the House Armed Forces Service Committee, January 27, 1964, that the Vietnamese war "was going badly" and the United States must be ready "to take all necessary measures" to prevent a Communist victory. He did not spell out these "necessary measures" but every informed person must now realize that the so-called Vietnamese government forces are not going, whether this junta or several later, to win the war against the Vietnamese people.

The U.S. Government has these choices: (1) Get out of Vietnam as President de Gaulle recommends and turn it over to an international conference; (2) carry on as presently, which can only mean eventual military defeat; or (3) escalate the war by taking it over completely as was done in Korea.

This is why it is imperative that the concerned people of the United States inform their leaders by every nonviolent means possible that they do not want war in Vietnam and cannot support one there. They should insist that the U.S. leaders call an international conference for the settlement of this dispute. And they should be supported in this call by people everywhere. For this is a world problem, and the world must have a voice in its solution. Otherwise, it is almost certain to escalate into the unthinkable thermonuclear war and "journey's end" for man.

HUGH B. HESTER,

*Brigadier General, U.S. Army (Retired).*

(The writer of this article was Director of Procurement of Supplies for General MacArthur's forces in the southwest Pacific from Australian sources under Reverse Lend Lease Agreements, 1942-45, and in charge of the Food and Agricultural Program, U.S. Zone of Germany, 1945-47.)

[Twenty-five copies of this leaflet for \$1]

#### CHINESE ATTITUDES VERSUS U.S. AGGRESSIONS (By Hugh B. Hester)

According to the Associated Press, October 16, 1963, President Kennedy told seven editors of women's magazines in two on-the-record interviews (June 14 and August 1, 1963) that "General and complete disarmament will not be possible without a change of attitude by Communist China." Didn't the President put the cart before the horse? Is it not U.S. policies that prevent general and complete disarmaments instead of Chinese attitudes?

What does the record show? Did not the U.S. Government violate the United Nations Charter provision, prohibiting one nation from interfering in the domestic affairs of another, when Mr. Truman placed the 7th U.S. Fleet in the Chinese Straits of Formosa, June 1950? Was this not an act of war also against China by the United States?

The Chinese leaders so consider it for the reasons noted below. They point out that Chiang Kai-shek, Winston Churchill, and Franklin Roosevelt agreed at Cairo, Egypt, 1943, that Formosa was a part of China and would be returned to China after victory over the Japanese. This was confirmed at Potsdam (Berlin, Germany) by Atlee, Stalin, and Truman, August 1945. In accordance with these agreements, they continue, the Japanese military forces on these islands surrendered to Chinese military forces at the end of the war in the Pacific. It is true that the Cairo and Potsdam agreements were not formal treaties, but executive agreements generally have the same force in international law as treaties. Most of this vast code consists of the former.

The record also shows that the illegal U.S. act of war against China, June 1950, took place 4 months before the Chinese entered the Korean war. Allen S. Whiting, in a Rand Corp. research study, "China Crosses the Yalu" (the MacMillan Co., N.Y., 1960) completely exonerated China from any complicity surrounding the start of the Korean war. He also shows as the "United Nations" forces approached the 38° parallel in the counter offensive that the Chinese leaders tried desperately to warn them against crossing the North Korean border, stating such an act would involve one of China's core interests. These warnings were disregarded with the result: "China Crosses the Yalu."

Many people in the United States do not know it, but some very distinguished international lawyers believe that the United Nations forces, under U.S. command, committed an act of aggression when they crossed the 38° parallel. There is even considerable evidence to support the charge that some U.N. forces crossed this parallel even before authority was given by the United Nations for them to do so.

Did the editors ask the President why the United States insists upon keeping Chiang Kai-shek in nominal possession of Formosa, the Pescadores, Quemoy, and Matsu Islands? Or didn't they know that the U.S. Government agreed in 1943, and again in 1945, that these islands belonged to the Chinese? Did they ask the President why the U.S. Government has violated, and continues to violate, Chinese territory by air, land, and sea through aid to the pretender, Chiang Kai-shek?

There is no evidence that the above facts were discussed by the President with the editors of the women's magazines. What answers, if any, were given by the President to the following questions: Who has kept China from occupying her charter seat in the United Nations? Who has refused normal relations including trade, and who has done everything possible, except actual invasion, to prevent others from normalization of their relations with her?

These are not rhetorical or theoretical questions. An honest answer to all of them is required, if we are to have peace. The record will show, in the opinion of this writer, that the U.S. Government has committed many acts of aggression against the Republic of China of which only a few have been listed above. China is not the sole victim of these illegal—in an international sense—acts. Charges of U.S. aggression against Iran, 1953, Guatemala, 1954, Cuba, 1961-62, could be made and supported in the opinion of many international lawyers.

Whether charges of aggression against the U.S. Government in the instances cited above would be sustained by an international court would ultimately depend, of course, upon the composition of the court. But no court, however corrupt or prejudiced, could fail to find that the U.S. Government has violated its commitments under the United Nations Charter in many instances, and in addition, the OAS Charter in the case of Cuba. The fact that the U.S. Government has not been so found by the U.N. General Assembly, or the U.N. Security Council, is attributed solely to the simple fact that the U.S. Government and her "allies" control too many votes in these two bodies. The Assembly and Security Council are political, not judicial bodies.

In the light of the above, does it not come with poor grace for the President to try to cover up the massive increases made, and continuing to be made, in armament by his administration by charging that "general and complete disarmament will not be possible without a change in attitude by Communist China"? Isn't this typical "Kennedian" doubletalk? Harrop Freeman, a distinguished professor of law, Cornell University,

and his wife, Ruth, in a book, "Dear Mr. President," cite scores of instances of doubletalk in Mr. Kennedy's career. These seem to be an innate part of his political philosophy.

What would be the attitude of the people of the United States toward a foreign government which had announced as public policy many times its intention of destroying the U.S. Government? And what is even much more important, the U.S. Government has not only announced these intentions against both China and Cuba, but has been for years taking active steps to implement them.

Why the feigned hurt and surprise by the Kennedy administration and its two predecessors, that the Chinese Government and people do not like the U.S. Government. Would the people of the United States be fond of a foreign government that placed a Benedict Arnold on Staten Island, and maintained him there, as a pretender to power over them?

That a change in attitude of the Chinese Government and people is necessary before disarmament is possible, is true, but a fundamental change in the U.S. Government's policies toward China is a sine qua non of China's change in attitude. It is U.S. Government policies around the world, not Chinese attitudes, that make impossible general and complete disarmament.

HUGH B. HESTER,

*Brigadier General, U.S. Army (Retired).*

Postscript: This was written before Mr. Kennedy was assassinated, but it was the policies of his administration the writer was criticizing. These have not changed and, unless and until these are changed, nothing can prevent eventual world disaster. China simply cannot live with these policies permanently and concerned citizens should never permit an opportunity to pass without so informing the U.S. power elite of this lone fact.

HUGH B. HESTER.

VIETNAM, 1964—KOREA, 1950

Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, has declared that the United States is already extending the Vietnamese war into North Vietnam and the "plan is to use nuclear weapons." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 14, 1964.)

Senator MORSE and too few other outstanding Senators are warning their colleagues and hoping to alert the people of this Nation to "McNamara's war," as MORSE dubbed it.

Our newspaper editorial in July of 1950 said: "We pointblank refuse to peddle the delusion that the Korean adventure is a way to peace. We also bluntly reject the thesis that American honor and prestige will be advanced by those who seek to make our country the policeman for world, reaction, and counterrevolution."

This newspaper and its farm organization stood alone against the NFU's 75-year war then. U.S. action in Vietnam now is merely an extension of the same policy by the same establishment.

Recent information of Truman's order to recognize China in March of 1950 was reversed by the hidden government that, like a panther, has laid in wait to pounce upon the defenseless peoples of the world who seek their freedom as we sought and got ours in 1776.

Misinformation on the alleged strength of the United States in Korea is one of the greatest dangers we face. MORSE rightly warns: "If the advocates of our present policy could only get a wide section of American public support for that kind of operation, we would start losing American boys by the score."

In 1950 Marcantonio fought alone against the Korean "police action." Now there are many allies in the Senate, but the people are silent.

19366

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500030003-1

August 20

Correspondence with the White House and the State Department on U.S. activity in Vietnam appears in the April issue of Farm News.

Two dollars gets U.S. Farm News and a campaign to get out of Vietnam. 1024 Grand (9), Des Moines, Iowa.

NEW BEDFORD, MASS.,  
August 10, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Many thanks for your thoughtful and independent position in the Senate in reaction to the Vietnam crisis. Our U.S. provocation in the area has been enormous. If the truth were presented to the U.S. people were clearly I think that all of us would see how doubtful our actions in defense of "freedom" in the area have been. Ultimately the problems of the area have to be solved over the conference table. Let us all bend our efforts to this end.

Very truly yours,  
Mrs. C. M. PATTERSON, Jr.

POMONA, CALIF.,  
August 9, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: My family and I support your views regarding the war in South Vietnam. Continue your courageous fight on our behalf.

Sincerely,

H. M. YERBY.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,  
August 9, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your forthright, logical position on the dangerous southeast Asia turmoil is the only correct one.

Our Nation's democratic tradition is being sullied by our interference with other democratic processes.

LOUIS DINNERSTEIN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 9, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Thank you greatly for your latest demonstration of courage, sanity, humanity, practicality, and responsibility in voting against support of Presidential power in Vietnam. The war in Vietnam is criminal; the U.S. Government is involved in a criminal act, and those who support it are to one degree or another, criminal.

MICHAEL MURPHY.

AUGUST 9, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for voting against stepping into the Vietnam war.

I trust you will continue in your opposition to it.

Sincerely yours,

MARIAN C. FREYER.  
P.S.—Written on train.

M.C.F.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
August 8, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Your stand against our making war in Vietnam is a courageous one—and this is to extend our appreciation and thanks for your voice—against this great provocation for another Korea—or worse.

It is madness. There must be millions of people in this country for whom you are the only spokesman. So please continue to wage the good peace.

HAI OLD KAYS.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,  
August 9, 1964.

DEAR SIR: History will vindicate you and Senator GRUENING, 2 of 90.

MacArthur's warning about war on the Asian mainland will haunt us. Also the U.N. Charter pledges: "No interference in the internal affairs of sister states."

You have the thanks of all unblinkered Americans.

Sincerely,

ELLWOOD CROSS

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

August 7, 1964.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your courage and integrity and sense in foreign policy, both southeast Asia and foreign aid. Keep it up.

M. RAOS.

I certainly want to pay you on the back for your stand on the southeast Asia war, also the Alaska Senator.

Your truly,

A. CARPENTER.

CHICAGO, ILL.,  
August 10, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE:

Your negative vote on President Johnson's actions in North Vietnam meets with my approval. I commend you for your courage to carry through your convictions.

Would you please send me a copy of your speech made on the Senate floor.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY GOOD.

EUCLID, OHIO,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Keep up the dissention. Keep us out of southeast Asia. Yours is the lone sane voice.

J. D. VON FISCHKE.

AUGUST 6, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your strong stand on the Vietnam issue. We appreciate your courage in going against the tide.

We don't want another war. We don't even want another "police action."

Let us, as a peace-loving people, abide by the Geneva Convention. Let us withdraw all U.S. forces from southeast Asia.

Respectfully,

Mrs. RUTH KAHN.  
TRUDI KAHN.  
NIRIA KAHN.  
LAURIE KAHN.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just to assure you of my support for your continued opposition to the war in South Vietnam and your vote in the Senate today in not supporting the President's action in Tonkin Bay.

Sincerely,

EILEEN E. FOLSOM.

My admiration for your refusal to support the united front resolution favoring the incident's response.

Give 'em hell at the convention, WAYNE.

J. MARQUARD.

SEATTLE, WASH.,  
August 6, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Have just read an article in the morning P.I. "MORSE Says United States Shares Blame for Viet Crisis." Like a voice crying in the wilderness, but how right you are.

Hope you can get the President and others to see the truth of what you say and not let us get dragged into a predated war. So few people really understand what has been going on over there for so long. Have tried to talk about it with my own family and even they think I am soft on communism. All we can do is keep on trying. Will write my own Senators now, too.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ADRIANE B. ISTAS.

RESPONSE ON VIETNAM

To those who have taken the time and effort to inform themselves on the back-

ground of U.S. involvement in Vietnam and the alternatives which were open to us to resolve the situation, the military escalation directed by President Johnson comes as an appalling shock.

With only Senators MORSE and GRUENING voicing opposition to our policy, at this writing, it occurred to me to inquire at their respective offices as to the response being registered by their constituents, via letter and telegram, to their dissenting position. I was informed that Senator MORSE had received 200 telegrams by 11 o'clock on the morning of August 8, and that "all but 1 or 2" congratulated him on his stand, taken the previous afternoon, condemning our actions in Vietnam. Senator GRUENING's office reported on the same morning that of several thousand letters received during the past few weeks on Vietnam the percentage was "between 400 and 500 to 1 in support of the Senator."

It may be that the constituents of Senators GRUENING and MORSE are better informed than most of the American public, but a poll of the general electorate in this country might well reveal, on the basis of the above statistics, that our war in Vietnam is not only stupid and unjust, but lacks the support of the average American citizen.

MARK W. CORNELIS.

WASHINGTON.

[From Washington News, Aug. 13, 1964]

VIETNAM GIMMICK

SIR: Is President Johnson's belated action in Vietnam going to fool the American public? I don't think so. It was obviously a vote-getting gimmick. Election year jitters?

BARRY GOLDWATER has been urging for years that we stop shaking our knees every time the Commies raise their ugly little PT boat heads.

Apparently the President, realizing that he cannot control the racial riots at home, has decided to divert the attention of news media to one of the many areas that should have been cleaned out long ago.

RUTH COULTER.

LET'S GET OUT

President Johnson's order for United States air action in North Vietnam increases the danger for a world conflagration. We invite intervention by China and Russia, and with it, the escalation into nuclear war. The location of our ships was legal but provocative in the present tense situation.

Just why are we in South Vietnam? Does this country belong to us? Is it not possible that there is a legitimate revolution of the people going on there? The Government now in South Vietnam was not elected by the people and does not represent them. South Vietnam has known nothing but tyranny for the last 10 years, yet we insist on a policy of noninterference in everything but fighting.

A negotiated settlement by all countries concerned is the best solution. The President must call for the reconvening of the Geneva powers—the countries, including the People's Republic of China, which settled the French Indochina War in 1954—to plan the demilitarization and neutralization of the whole southeast Asia area.

MIRIAM LEVIN.

CHEVY CHASE.

THE "MAJDOX" INCIDENT

Taken at face value the account by the Defense Department of the battle in the Gulf of Tonkin appears to be a clear-cut case of unprovoked attack by North Vietnam on American naval ships in international waters. But if one stops a moment to consider why such an attack should be launched the picture becomes murky indeed. Why should North Vietnam, without provocation, attack U.S. destroyers? Did North Vietnam,

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500030003-1

1964  
Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

with its 40 or 50 torpedo boats, expect to do in the U.S. 7th Fleet? Hardly.

The answer as I see it is that North Vietnam was very definitely provoked and, further, that it was provoked for a very definite reason. The question of how the provocation was brought off is secondary. The fact that the President and the chief U.N. delegate assume self-righteous postures is simply par for the course, which has been played often in the past few years. It is, in fact, expressly the value of such provocation, if successful, relative to the American position in South Vietnam that leads to the conclusion that the situation must have been provoked. In other words, considering the weakness of the American position in the south, the sudden appearance of the Tonkin Gulf battle and its outcome is simply too fortuitous an event for that position to be viewed as independent of it. As to why North Vietnam took the bait, even under the most extreme provocation; it miscalculated badly.

Furthermore, this action is probably preparatory to the landing of South Vietnamese forces in some number on the long northern coastline, a coastline no longer defended by 40 or 50 torpedo boats.

By way of conclusion it is not difficult to see that what is taking place now in Vietnam is a nautical variation of the tactic used against the Cuban Air Force in the days before the Bay of Pigs invasion. I believe we can expect at least one and possibly two more related moves before the actual landings begin. In general, however, I believe that the liabilities which fractured the Cuban adventure will shortly appear in this new effort. In short, we are about to be graced with a Far Eastern Bay of Pigs. We deserve nothing less.

HERMAN M. HEYN.

BALTIMORE.

TUCSON, ARIZ.,  
August 11, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Tucsonians support your proposal to negotiate to end aimless Vietnam war. Names follow.

ROSLYN EINFRAK.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
August 10, 1964.

WAYNE B. MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. You are right. Bombs will not bring democracy to Vietnam. Give us peace.

LAWRENCE ROSE, M.D.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
August 11, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Sincerest appreciation, your truth in Senate, where sorely needed. Many with you. Peace in honor.

ROBERT M. MAXEY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
August 10, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Please accept my congratulations on your sane and courageous stand regarding Vietnam. Keep it up.

Mrs. V. SUBIAN.

NUTLEY, N.J.,  
August 9, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: When I read your statements concerning our Vietnamese and

southeast Asian policies, I regretted not being a resident of the State of Oregon. I would be proud indeed to have a voice like yours to represent me and my family in the Senate of the United States.

It is heartening to realize that there is at least one Senator who has the intelligence and the courage to point out the immoral nature of our presence militarily in southeast Asia and the violation of international agreements which this presence entails. It is particularly difficult to speak out at times when jingoism and bipartisan "patriotism" both insist that other nations of the world must be cast in a mold formed by some of our political and military leaders.

May your courage not fail you in the future when it becomes necessary to speak out against false self-righteousness in our foreign policy, and may you find increasing support among the liberal Members of the Senate.

Respectfully yours,

GERALD STILLMAN.

cc: Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
August 10, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Thoroughly support your sane, courageous opposition to U.S. military adventure in Vietnam. Hope you prevail.

Mrs. RAY CHAPMAN.

BERKELEY, CALIF.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,  
August 11, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Admire and support your courageous stand against Vietnam war.

CORRINE and TOM GOLDSTICK.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
August 10, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

I support your position on Vietnam. Thanks for your sanity. You must be heard.

BARBARA BLASKO.

BAYSIDE, N.Y.,  
August 11, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U. S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily support your stand on withdrawing troops from Vietnam and reconvening Geneva Convention.

BENJAMIN, DOROTHY, PETER HOLZMAN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
August 10, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo for your stand for peace in the Vietnam crisis.

JANE BISHOP.

BERKELEY, CALIF.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
August 10, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Your fight against Vietnam war wonderful. Tell Senator GRUENING, too. My future children thank you.

WILLIAM D. LEARNED.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
August 10, 1964.

U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am one of your staunch supporters even though I've known

Sig Unander for over 20 years. Mentally, he would flounder about in but one of your shoes.

Your fight against the press has far more importance than is at first apparent to our fellow citizens. I have watched with dismay the gradual change of their mission, which is to purvey the news—the facts—to what the press now regards as its primary mission, that of molders of public opinion. Public opinion, if I read the publishers' aims correctly, should coincide with that of the editors and this they strive to accomplish by use of semantics in the reporting of the news, columnists of whom they are sure, and sometimes by deliberately falsifying the news by leaving out some of the pertinent facts.

Editors are free to have their own opinions but it should be restricted to the editorial pages or under the signature of the editors, not by pretending to report the facts. This is a most serious question that confronts us.

I am also in accord with your fight against aid, but not on the grounds that we are throwing away our money. I believe that our help should be restricted to what the country can produce within its own confines. Take food as an example. We are changing the eating habits of people. We are giving them means to buy meat and wheat which the country itself has never produced, and can never produce. As long as we provide the means, this will work. One day, we will get tired of this drain on our own resources and their people will have to go back to the rice, beans, etc., which has nourished them for centuries. The result will be discontent, disease, and even starvation because the country itself cannot produce what we have obliged them to be accustomed to. The same goes for steel mills and other facilities which we are installing in countries which cannot produce the raw materials. It will then be our own fault.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

OSCAR COLCAIRE.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
August 11, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly support your stand against American intervention in Vietnam. Keep it up.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. VITOR HONIG.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
August 10, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

You have earned place American history. Keep up the fight.

Mr. and Mrs. AUBREY GROSSMAN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
August 10, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations for your forthright stand on Vietnam. Please keep up good fight. We're with you.

MARCIA ROSE.

AUGUST 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Over the radio, several times, I have heard your expressions of concern over our active participation in the war in South Vietnam. I should like to take this opportunity of commending you on your courage in declaring your principles. I must say it takes a lot of courage, in the light of what happened in Dallas almost a year ago, to voice a contrary opinion, publicly. Even though your voice in the interests of human-

19868

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

August 20

ity is but one of a minute minority, it will and must be heard; and it is.

I am deeply concerned about our activities in southeast Asia. Why are we actively engaged in an undeclared war, many, many thousands of miles from our shores which, to all appearances, poses no threat to our homeland. Our concern about the spread of communism is no excuse for helping to bolster up rotten regimes which are already tottering. Furthermore, if communism is an idea, it cannot be killed, no matter how many people are killed, and we might as well become realistic and accept the world as it is, not as it might have been in the Dark Ages.

I am for peace and would like to see elected an administration which will maintain peace; but, it would appear that both our political parties stand on the same platform, with this difference that Senator Goldwater openly comes out for war, while our present administration is carrying on a war—even one not declared by Congress.

Very respectfully yours,

NETTIE SCHWARTZ,

SAN MARCOS, CALIF.

LANSING, MICH.,  
August 11, 1964.

WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senator,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

Urge favorite son candidacy to present your Vietnam and constitutional views to Nation. Wholehearted support.

MORIAN COLLINS.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.,  
August 6, 1964.

HON. Senator WAYNE MORSE: Thank you for your remarks to the Senate (and to the press) concerning our behavior in South Vietnam and particularly concerning our part in the PT boat affair. Are you the only intelligent, honest, and courageous person left in government?

Based on my thinking on previous collusion between the military, the CIA, and the press, my first thought was that the PT boat attack had been staged. Lack of details is tending to confirm my hunch.

Sincerely,

JAMES KOHFELD.

SOMERVILLE, N.J.,  
August 8, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support your stand on southeast Asia 100 percent. Keep up your work for peace. You speak for the interests of the majority of the people in the United States. If it is not too much trouble could I have copies of what you consider your recent important speeches to pass around to interested friends.

Stand firm.

ALLEN GOLDBERG.

REDDING, CALIF.,  
August 8, 1964.

HON. Senator MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want you to know that we are grateful and proud of your wise and courageous stand in general, and in the present east Asian crisis in particular. And there are many who share our appreciation of you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. F. W. WENNER.

AUGUST 7, 1964.

SENATOR MORSE: I feel a deep sense of gratitude to you for your courageous stand against our action in Asia. If only more of our leaders were of your strength and wisdom, there may be hope for this world.

Sincerely,

MARCELINE JONES.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

SOUTH ORANGE, N.J.,  
August 8, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Once again you have proved to be a giant among little men.

We gratefully support your efforts to bring an end to the immoral, illegal war in Vietnam and to achieve a diplomatic solution.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT F. and LUCILLE BECKER.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for taking your stand to expose those things that are not right. We appreciate the fact that this is not the way to make friends of influential people, and sometimes it is political suicide. We admire your courage and forthrightness.

Many times you will be standing alone, but stand, won't you? Others seeing your bravery will rally around, for guts begets guts.

At your leisure, should you desire, send us names of honest courageous souls who need encouragement.

A friend of the cause.

Sincerely,

JIM PUGH.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
Saturday.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to express support for your Vietnam stand. Thank you for having the courage to say what you did.

Having viewed pictures in Life magazine of the atrocities committed by "our side," I wonder at our claims of moral superiority.

Whatever happened to Senator FULBRIGHT's suggestion that we reassess our foreign policy?

Cordially,

BEATRICE RUTH WILLIAMS  
Mrs. R. C. Williams.

St. LOUIS, MO.,  
August 10, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to commend you for your stand in the Senate on the Vietnam issue and to say that I and many others agree with you. We should not be in South Vietnam. It is not a military problem, and should be dealt with in the U.N. or a 14-nation conference.

I see no reason why the United States should refuse such a meeting. President Johnson claims it would be a conference to ratify terror—which is a false, meaningless statement.

In the face of the possibilities a hot war which would develop into nuclear bombing and involve all the great powers—such excuses cannot be tolerated.

We must work for a solution—but not a military one—because it is not possible. The U.N. should be strengthened and all nations should be members—this is where the world's hope for peace lies—and we must use it.

Respectfully yours,

ILSE SHANK.

HAVERTOWN, PA.,  
August 10, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you for your forthright and courageous statements regarding the Vietnam situation. With your voice being heard I feel that all is not quite lost in the battle for reason in this problem.

Please keep fighting. There are many behind you.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. JULIAN J. GASPARRO.

ANAHEIM, CALIF.,  
August 8, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In these days of hysteria in high places, I commend you for your stand on Vietnam.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR A. TIFFANY.

HURON, S. DAK.,  
August 8, 1964.

U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SENATOR MORSE: Just a word of praise for your (almost alone) determined stand against the so-called Asian resolution. It appears there was no need for it at this time.

Sincerely yours,

J. B. HENRICHSEN.

LILLINGTON, N.C.,  
August 10, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to take this opportunity to commend you for your vigorous fight against so much foreign aid that serves no great useful purpose and also for your almost single opposition against the surrender of congressional control of the use of power by the President in the area of war. Further, I like your spirit of independence and the firm stand for right under law, even in the face of great opposition. I would like to see a greater voice in favor of law and order for more enforcement against crime and violence. I enclose copy of letter that expresses my individual opinion against present-day conditions, with the understanding that you are not in any way bound by my view.

Yours very truly,

WALTER LEE JOHNSON.

FORT WORTH, TEX.,  
August 8, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are right by wanting to refuse placing all power in the President's hands. It seems to me we should fight our own wars. I do not have any faith in the United Nations. Look what happened at Suez; at least as I remember, the U.N. took the responsibility of the situation there, and put the canal right back into the hands of the Egyptian Government.

I still believe our Congress should declare war, and that looks like we have one.

Senator MORSE, it seems to me we should at all times keep a strong defense of our country. I just do not believe we should merge in a one-world government. That looks like this disarmament program is a bad thing for the United States.

Thanks to you for speaking out on these matters. They are very serious.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. EDITH KNIGHT.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,  
August 6, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It must be very difficult to steadfastly maintain as you have that the United States should remove themselves from the Vietnam civil war. For your position up to date I have admired you. For your very courageous dissent yesterday, you have a good deal more of my respect.

I agree completely that the United States, whether 3 miles offshore, or 6 miles offshore, had no business "patrolling" in the waters off North Vietnam. It was, in my eyes, provocation of the most highhanded sort. The "retaliation" of the United States against the gunboat bases was outrageous and very dangerous gamesmanship-type stuff.

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1



1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19869

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

Again, my most sincere regard for you and best wishes in the dissents to come.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. ELLEN B. SIMER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

August 9, 1964.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,  
Washington D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Escalation of the war in Vietnam would be madness. Immediate negotiation is the only rational course. Senator WAYNE MORSE has made abundantly clear that our Vietnam policy has been open to severe criticism in the past and that our present claim that we are resisting aggression is obviously false. I strongly urge you to support Senator MORSE's stand.

Yours truly,

JULIET GREEN,

WHITTIER, CALIF.,

August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As one U.S. citizen, I heartily approve of your no vote on the measure giving President Johnson the war power.

Yours truly,

WALTER PLAUT.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

August 8, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Our sincere compliments to you for your forthright, courageous stand on our recent actions in Vietnam.

Yours, it seems, is the only voice the people have with the courage and conviction to question policies and actions that could lead to another international conflict.

More power to your, sir.

Cordially yours,

AUL ZUDAW.

ANNA BROADCASTING CO., INC.,

ANNA, ILL., August 8, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I admire your courage. There are too few who are willing to take a stand they believe in and stick to it. You are in a much better position to learn the facts of the Vietnam situation than I but you may be interested in the enclosed editorial.

If you have time to drop a line giving your reaction to this, I would certainly appreciate it.

Sincerely,

DON MICHEL,  
Manager, Radio-Anna.

P.S.—You might pass the extra copy to the Senator from Alaska if you think he would be interested.

[Radio-Anna editorial, Aug. 6, 1964]

#### THE CRISIS IN VIETNAM AND OUR GOVERNMENT

The current crisis in Vietnam is cause for great concern to all of us. In this case, as in some previous instances we must depend for the time being, almost entirely, on news released by our Government, since there is little else available. The action is taking place in areas where our correspondents are not permitted to be. Therefore, as one of the top United Press International men in New York told WRAJ yesterday, it is somewhat like trying to describe a penguin battle at the North Pole, through secondhand reports.

We must, he said, take some things "on faith" at this point, remembering that the record of our Government for truthfulness has, overall, been considerably better than that of the Communists.

However, that is not to say there is not reason to look between the lines of the Government dispatches. It is a sobering fact of life, that our Government has, in recent times, given us cause to doubt the truthfulness of some of its statements.

Quite fresh in our memory is the Cuban incident in which our Central Intelligence Agency trained an exile army, equipped it secretly and sent B-26 bombers over Cuba to bomb Castro's airfields, with fake Cuban markings on the planes, and had the pilots land in Florida and say they had deserted from Castro's air force, while in fact they were trained, equipped, and sent over Cuba by our own Government.

You will recall that our Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, eloquently defended us against charges that we were guilty of aggression against Cuba, only to learn later that these were, in fact, our planes.

There have been other incidents: the U-2 flight over Russia that President Eisenhower at first denied was a spy flight, even though we had been carrying out such flights for some time, and others.

These incidents cause thinking people not to always take at face value our official Government pronouncements. Again quoting a high United Press official: "we used to believe that an official Government announcement could be depended upon \* \* \* after the Cuban incident, we became so wary that if the Government made an announcement that 'Today is Tuesday' we began to look around at the calendar and wonder if it really was."

This is not to say that any falsehoods have been perpetrated in the current Vietnam crisis by our Government. At this point all we can do is take on faith the news from our Government sources in Vietnam. And we recognize that our Government has, overall, earned a reputation for being truthful. It is disturbing however to realize that there are instances in the not too distant past when the American people have been deceived.

One high Government official—Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester—even made the statement after the Cuban crisis that the Government has an inherent right to lie, to save itself when it's going up into a nuclear war. This is a policy which cannot be tolerated and which was promptly challenged by the news media of this country and was to have been thrashed out once and for all in a conference between Government and the press. That meeting was postponed and never held; so the question remains unanswered. Does the Government have the right to lie, at any time? We think not. For this then puts the responsibility on mortal men of deciding just when it is necessary.

We don't think men are capable of rendering this judgment.

The purpose of this editorial is to point out the need for concern, the need for insistence upon the part of the American public, on basic honesty and integrity in the Government of our great country. For if we would stray from these principles too far we would become like those countries whom we now oppose. The Communists have long been guided by the principle that the end justifies the means. Chester Bowles said in an interview over this station one time that the Communists cannot be counted on to keep their word—only so long as it is to their advantage to do so.

In times of crisis like these we must unite. We must pull together. If war should come, we must all put our shoulders to the wheel and bear the burden, for we have a truly great Nation, the most freedom, the highest privileges of any citizens on the earth. And we cherish these freedoms dearly.

We must, however, guard against destructions of these freedoms from within, by insisting upon absolute, basic honesty from

those who we choose to lead us, from the precinct committeemen to the highest officials of the land.

For if honesty should ever become obsolete our Nation would fall.

Let us hope that when the Vietnam crisis of 1964 becomes a part of history, that our Nation will have more reason to hold its head high than it did after the Cuban Bay of Pigs fiasco of 1961.

DON MICHEL,

Manager-Editor.

LANCASTER, CALIF.,

August 11, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE:

It is gratifying that you continue your efforts to oppose the policy of the State Department and the militarists in their war in southeast Asia. You are outstanding in honesty and decency. Have just learned that only you and Senator GRUENING have the integrity to vote against the President's request for congressional approval of continuation of U.S. war against the people of that brutalized country and surroundings.

It is certain when the history of this time is recorded for posterity you will be the most outstanding personality to honor.

It still remains a fact that the United States cannot ever win the war against the Asian people even with all its military might. And every day this senseless and sickening brutality against a nation continues it takes us nearer to the point of no return.

The best of good wishes and praise to you.

Sincerely,

PEARL R. GOODING.

AUGUST 6, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for continuing to be intelligent and independent. I thoroughly approve your stand against the resolution backing more military action in Vietnam.

It appears to me that a deliberate attempt has been made recently to create a war-scare mentality concerning Vietnam in the news media. I would appreciate your sending me a copy of any statements you have made recently on the subject, especially since I feel that the news generally available is so distorted.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ELAINE V. DAVENPORT.

RENTON, WASH.

CHICAGO, ILL.,

August 9, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I want to thank you for your principal action in refusing to vote in favor of the President's authorization of attack in North Vietnam. I am in accord with your belief that the Congress should not abdicate its responsibility to declare war.

Very truly yours,

HELEN RUEBEN.

MONTEREY, CALIF.

SIR: Information here is hard to come by, but on one radiocast your name was mentioned as having opposed President Johnson's actions in Vietnam, if this is true, and I hope it is, I would like to compliment you on your stand. It was undoubtedly considered unpopular, un-American, and unpatriotic.

It seems at this time that this precipitous action has not led to immediate consequences, but it well might have, and was (as far as my meager information can tell) unwarranted. Looked at from even an objective American standpoint, the apparent aggression of the United States is hard to contain. Looked at, as it must be, by the rest of the world, it is nothing less than outright aggression. It seems to me that a country as powerful as the United States need not retaliate to such an extent.

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

19870

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - SENATE

August 20

I attend Reed College, Portland, and if you would care to speak there, I could possibly arrange it, though I represent only myself. Anyway, I wanted to let you know that some people do agree with your position.

STAFFORD LELAND.

BRONX, N.Y.,  
August 8, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I be privileged to add my voice to that of the minority in our country. Your voice of reason has given us a beacon of hope for a world at peace.

Is it not time to reappraise over policy of using force and with if the menacing threat of a full-scale war?

We have the peacekeeping machinery to maintain a world at peace. The present policy of Mr. Johnson in Vietnam strikes terror the very hearts of all of us.

Your courage and your strength are in the best traditions of all that we hold most dear—an independence of mind and the courage to articulate it.

With profound respect,

TRIZ MERDE.

AUGUST 10, 1964.

THE PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Hurrah for Senators MORSE and GRUENING.

They're the only ones in Congress with enough brains and honesty to see the Vietnamese situation clearly.

Withdraw American forces from North Vietnam. Negotiate.

We know that the official version of the story of the attack on the *Madrox* omitted to mention a crucial fact—that the American ship was escorting South Vietnamese raiders.

E. W. BROCKMAN.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

AUGUST 10, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

I wish to express my sincere admiration for your convictions and the courage to express them. Let me assure you that a good many people share your convictions and regard you as their spokesman. Even in the Senate there were 10 abstentions when the vote on our policy in Vietnam was taken.

This certainly is an instance when the minority is the purveyor of truth, and not the majority as we are used to thinking.

Guns and bombs cannot settle international problems, they can only destroy; therefore, we must reject them. We must rely on negotiation, on neutralizing of South Vietnam. We must use peaceful means in order to live.

So keep up the good work for peaceful solutions, or else guns and bombs will destroy us all.

Respectfully,

IDA GOOD.

CHICAGO, ILL.

FOREST HILLS, N.Y.,  
August 9, 1964.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I apologize for not having written sooner; there is no excuse.

Thank you very much for having stood up against the war hysteria in the Vietnam crisis. It is becoming increasingly common that whenever some incident occurs, the factors causing it are ignored, and it is viewed simply as a matter of national honor. There can be no honor in aggression, or in accusing the victim for defending itself.

It is difficult forming an accurate judgment of exactly what happened, for we only have one version of the incident. There must be some way of increasing the avail-

ability of information. I do not think this is a danger to our security, but the converse is definitely a threat to democracy.

Once again, thank you for following your conscience. I wish you were Senator from New York.

Sincerely,

ROBERT FAM.

LAKELAND, FLA.,  
August 10, 1964.Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your opposition to the participation by the United States in the internal affairs of Vietnam. Your analysis of the situation is just, and I was glad to see Mr. Reston of the New York Times questioning who was first to punch.

Defensive war usually turns out to be offensive and defensive weapons are a temptation to any military mind. It is why I am a pacifist and for total disarmament. To use it is the best way, the Christian, if not American, way.

Sincerely,

JESSICA PRICE.

P.S.—I urge you to please back the Quebec - Washington - Guantanamo Peace Walk (CNVA) in its efforts to gain permission to sail from Miami to Cuba at once.

J.P.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,  
August 10, 1964.Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: No doubt you received many letters thanking you for your stand against our policy of aggression in Vietnam. Unfortunately it becomes more and more apparent that our democracy is not strong enough to stay the bloody hands of the Pentagon with its warmakers; while you stand alone as one shining light above those many who act as rubberstamps and remain too cowardly to cry out against the needless slaughter in South and North Vietnam.

Respectfully yours,

IRVINE LAND.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know how very much our family respects you. You personify intellectual integrity, courage, and true humanitarianism in an age where beligerent nationalism is the safe and accepted role for the politician. We have heard some of your speeches read over KPFA, listeners sponsored radio in Berkeley, and applaud your stand on Vietnam. Certainly, the problem there (and elsewhere) is essentially political and economic and not military.

Thanks to you, a voice of reason is heard in the land: As Socrates was to Athens, so you are to the United States. Please continue to do all you can to enlighten your colleagues and the American people. You are not alone, Senator; there are a great many for whom you speak.

May God bless you in every way.

Yours,

J. W. HACKETT.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,  
August 9, 1964.

DEAR SIR: May I join the hundreds whom I am sure have written to you extolling your vote against allowing the President a free hand in southeast Asia.

I feel that the retaliatory bombing of North Vietnam shows a complete lack of understanding of present world situation. It is a return to the anachronism of the old policy of containment.

Peace can best be achieved through an expansion of the United Nations and neutralization of peripheral areas, such as southeast Asia.

I am beginning to feel that for Democrats such as myself there seems to be no home. President Johnson is, unfortunately, adopting many of the stances of Senator GOLDWATER. There are a great many, even here in this midwestern heartland, who wish to do something but are stymied. It is as though we the people have no voice in any of the affairs in our country. We can write to the newspapers and write to our Congressmen.

What do you suggest?

Sincerely,

JUSTINE EISEMAN  
Mrs. Wm. B. Elsemann.

AUGUST 9, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just written to Senators CLARK and SCOTT voicing my displeasure with the exodus from the Senate before your speech the other day and telling them that I am in complete agreement with your views on Vietnam. I shall follow this letter with letters to FULBRIGHT and KEATING.

Your courageous stand in this situation has made me very happy. It's nice to know that even one person isn't afraid to speak the truth. Unfortunately, one isn't enough. Keep up the good work, though and perhaps there will be people who will listen.

I think the United States is the greatest country on earth and I long to see us become a world leader in the true sense—that of a nation concerned with the welfare of all other people; with the liberty of all other people. To see the United States prostituting its great technological advances to exploit and terrorize lesser nations is indeed a sad thing.

Again, keep up the good work. Some of the people have heard already; others must hear also.

Gratefully,

P. A. POWERS.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

CORONA DEL MAR, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We have been following your work on the Vietnam situation and regardless of the fact that we are backing the President to the fullest of our capabilities we do have the feeling that you are right on the Vietnam situation. It is quite possible that North Vietnam is well off with their present type of government and at no expense to us. A recent television series tends to bear out this fact. One thing for sure the kids are getting a good education just as they are in the U.S.S.R. and Cuba, too for that matter. The fact that the educational system is not being run by some outside religious institution is of course "the nigger in the woodpile." We do not feel that some of those countries are ready for our type of so-called freedom. We cannot blame them if they had to accept if they (in taking on our ideology) had to accept some of the ideas concerning civil rights, exploitation by the "loan sharks" and the sinister "tax dodging" foundations, a dishonest stock market, collusive bidding against the Government, etc., in the package. In other words we have a lot of "dirty linen" that should be cleaned up before we advise some of these new nations how to "set up shop." We holler a lot about freedom but evidently there can be too much of this sort of thing and it has; as Mr. F.D.R. so aptly put it, "Freedom of the wolf." And it is more of this sort of freedom that the Goldwater crowd would thrust upon the country. Make the rich richer and the poor poorer is the motto which is nailed at the masthead of the Goldwater brand of GOPism. Give our best regards to the Senator from Alaska who is working with you. I am sending a copy of this letter to Secretary Rusk. He would be surprised to

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

19871

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 10, 1964.

know the number of one of the many folks who believe that we are wasting our time and money in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN S. LOUD.

P.S.—Sure glad to see you appearing on television. It gives the people something to think about.

WINNETKA, ILL.,  
August 9, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Many thanks for your courageous stand against giving the President the right to declare war without coming to the Congress for approval. Yours is a lone voice for sanity today, but we live and hope that your colleagues in Congress will follow your lead and stop this mad race toward extinction.

AUGUST 10, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The American people who are not brainwashed will thank you forever for your courageous stand against the intervention of President Johnson in Vietnam which has ruined the good name of America around the world.

Thank you again.

Your truly,

JOSEPH QUARANTA.

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO.

BELLFLOWER, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I want to commend you on your courageous stand against the Government policy in Vietnam. I am sincerely in accord with you and believe that our present policy of supporting these corrupt unwanted governments should be stopped.

I think also it is about time to change our ridiculous position on Cuba and go along with our European allies and also Canada and open up trade with her again. She would of probably never turned to Russia for help, but we intended to starve her into submission so what else could she do.

Sincerely,

CARL O. BENSON.

SILVER SPRING, MD.,  
August 9, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to congratulate you, and I want you to know that I fully support the stand you have taken on Vietnam, both now and in these last months.

Please do not lose heart because you are a great voice and force to all of us who want peace more than anything in life.

Your ardent admirer,

RUTH STARIN.

DETROIT, MICH.,  
August 8, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senator,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I thank you for standing up and voting against the North Vietnam resolution.

The course being followed of magnifying the authority of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and ignoring the constitutional power of Congress over the military I regard as of far greater danger to the Republic than any Communist menace.

The bombing of North Vietnam bases was a face-saving action necessitated by Presidential big talk—Presidential commitments made without constitutional authority—that gave the "free world" dictator of South Viet-

nam a beautiful opportunity.

President to make good his words.

There is irony in the fact that Great Britain now comes forth with paper support, while not sufficiently concerned to come forward with real military support of the President's program in South Vietnam. Mr. Lodge should have a very interesting time making explanations abroad.

Respectfully,

GEORGE M. MONTROSS.

BALTIMORE, MD.,  
August 7, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Be strengthened by the thought that many are thankful that there is at least one voice in our Senate that speaks sanely of the events in Vietnam. Hold firm and talk loudly, in the hope that reason may yet prove as contagious as fear and panic.

Sincerely,

RICHARD W. IRELAND.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,  
August 8, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: More power to you for your stand opposing President Johnson's resolution. I am ashamed for my country. We are presenting ourselves as bullies to the world.

There are too many pressing problems here at home. Instead of wasting our money, why not spend it on our own people. Just think of all the free medical care we could afford with the money spent in Vietnam. We could even afford to support all our poor, deserving or not.

I felt sad that only you and Senator GRUENING saw the Vietnam situation for what it is.

This country plays games with war because it has never seen the horrors of World Wars I and II on our own blessed soil.

Oh, well, like the saying, "God takes care of fools and children."

Sincerely,

MRS. CONCETTA SAGERT.

CHICAGO, ILL.,  
August 9, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to congratulate you on your courageous stand in voting against the resolution backing President Johnson's actions in the current Vietnam crisis. I believe, with you, that the President should not be given so much power to wage war, and in the particular situation, that the United States has no business in Vietnam. The area should be neutralized and arbitrated by some neutral body, such as the United Nations.

Sincerely yours,

EVELYN LEWERT  
Mrs. Robert Lewert.RYE, N.Y.,  
August 8, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am glad you voted against the action in Vietnam. Thousands of mothers like me will thank you for it.

Any unilateral action of this sort is bound to weaken the United Nations. And I had hoped for some more mature response from a country like the United States that has such a superiority of weapons at its disposal. I think we set a bad example which the Turks are now following.

Please keep up your efforts no matter what criticism you receive.

Sincerely,

MRS. GORDON WEBBER.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for television broadcast and your vote against the recent bombings in the Middle East. Not enough people are aware of the danger of a trigger-happy administration.

Yours truly,

MADELINE G. SACHS.

SCARSDALE, N.Y.,  
August 5, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your position on the President's actions in Vietnam. It is quite refreshing in this day of "going along with the majority" to see a human being of your stature standing up for what he feels is right. A government cannot expect its citizens to follow the law or have respect for the latter when they see our leaders so obviously take advantage of their positions and not use our Constitution as it was intended.

I will add that the action taken was what should have been done. I only feel it should have been the decision of Congress and not the Executive.

Although you and I are not in agreement many times, I felt compelled to go on record when we were. Thank you again, sir.

Sincerely,

DORGET LOMAX.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,  
August 8, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: There is no need for me to remind you of the cynicism of the policy of our Government as a whole regarding the crisis in Vietnam. You have shown the American people that you lack neither understanding nor courage by taking a forthright stand against this obnoxious policy.

The provocative actions in the Gulf of Tonkin—actions ordered by the President of the United States—culminate a series of atrocities which will one day rank with those perpetrated by the Nazis. Unfortunately we Americans have even less justification for claiming ignorance than do the Germans. Our press, though bias, has until very recently reported a great deal of the truth. The nature of chemical warfare, the ordeal of the Buddhists, the unpopularity of the many governments of South Vietnam, and the hypocrisy of the United States regarding the Geneva agreements should be apparent to all. Can anyone forget the photographs of the victims of our air attacks on Cambodia? Yet it is true that the American people do not care to remember and are united in its support of a man who has insured his election by betraying the real interest of the people.

This sad commentary on our country may indicate that we are no longer fit for world leadership. It certainly indicates that we are not morally fit for world leadership. While we may deserve destruction, it is impossible for me to see my young students, so full of life and yet so ready to die for false idols, without breathing a sigh of regret.

Very truly yours,

PARKER BARATTA.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 9, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your courageous and forthright stand on the Vietnam crisis.

I am sure that all intelligent Americans are grateful for the two lone voices of reason in the Senate. Would that you could per-

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

before the situation deteriorates any further.  
Cordially,

MAIJANNE WELCH.

AUGUST 8, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations for your worthy, moral, and human stand on the Vietnam situation. If your request for the ceasefire there is recognized, it will be a great service to the good and welfare of all mankind. Attached is a letter (duplicate) of the one I wrote to President Johnson. Could you show it to Senators CLEBURGH (Idaho), MANSFIELD (Montana), and Congressman RYAN (New York) who are also concerned with stopping small wars, that could lead up to a total-suicide war in which no one would win.

Attached is a leaflet that was handed to me. I asked for more. I signed one and sent it to President Johnson with the letter I wrote him.

Bless you and Senators Aiken, Bartlett, Church, Cooper, Ellender, Gruening, Johnston, Mansfield, Proxmire, and Congressmen Ryan, Farnstein, Burton, Siler, and the others who are also concerned for peace.

Good luck to you in your worthy endeavors to bring peace, sanity, and safety to the world.

Respectfully,

HAROLD E. FACKERT.

JERSEY CITY, N.J.

(Copy of letter I sent to President Johnson.)

AUGUST 8, 1964.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

DEAR SIR: It is to be hoped that all small wars and every war shall be stopped now, before someone presses the total-world-suicide button and annihilates the whole human race. Remember, please remember, our worthy late President John F. Kennedy said: "Mankind must put an end to war or war will put an end to mankind." And Dwight Eisenhower said: "No member of the human race can discover victory from such desolation a nuclear war would bring."

I hope you will take this Vietnam situation to the conference table and help save this earth planet for the children and posterity. Peace is the only deterrent to prevent the world's destruction and stop small wars that are a threat of bringing the horrible, terrible, final blow.

Think of your children's welfare and all other children throughout the world. As Dagmar Wilson said:

"To this new life we brought to birth  
We owe our heritage, the earth."

Yes, I would like to see you keep on living too, and carry on President Kennedy's traditions.

Yours respectfully,

HAROLD E. FACKERT.

JERSEY CITY, N.J.

P.S.—Author George Adams said: "More war anywhere is unthinkable for intelligent human beings."

I hope all mankind will reach this height of intelligence and prevent wars.

H.F.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

August 10, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank God we have in our legislative body one man with the courage and conviction to stand before the American people and tell the truth about our involvement in Vietnam and associated areas. Like Alexander, the Great, we want to control the world, and I fear that we are fast losing the respect and confidence of many of the other nations.

with appreciation and respect for your position, I am,

Yours sincerely,

MILDRED C. WHITNEY.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: Just a note of gratified endorsement that there is at least one sane mind on Capitol Hill with guts enough to buck the zombies.

Please don't abandon your great efforts to bring a measure of truth to the American public on the frightful Far Eastern crisis.

Very truly yours,

WYNN KAPIT.

ALLENTOWN, N.J.

August 10, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is just a note to say that I am in accord with your thinking on Vietnam. I just don't think we belong there. It takes much courage for a Member of the House or Senate to take a stand opposed to conflict even though it is more sensible. To talk tough seems to be the preferred way, although I don't for the life of me, see why.

Good luck.

STILES THOMAS.

EDISON, N.J.

August 10, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to tell you that my family and I are in full support of your stand on Vietnam. Americans must realize that the risk of world war should not be taken to protect one dictatorship from another. Perhaps the Vietnamese want the Communists, and maybe not, but we should not impose our will upon them.

It appears as if the North Vietnamese were wrong, but for a nation whose goal is peace, our response was greatly exaggerated and could have been very dangerous. I would appreciate it if you sent me a copy of your statement of Wednesday, the 5th, and other information on Vietnam. We must remember that the risk of a little lost prestige is nowhere near as important as the risk of war. I thank you.

Sincerely,

MICAH D. BERTIN.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

August 8, 1964.

Mr. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: May I thank you for the courageous stand you have taken against the congressional resolution backing the President's policy in southeast Asia?

Senator ERNEST GRUENING and you are doing the Nation a great service. I am positive that as time goes on more and more of us will see that we have no right to interfere in the affairs of the Vietnamese and that the only way out for us is negotiations. The administration will be compelled by the force of events, if it truly does not want an H-war, to take the step of negotiations.

I was heartened by the reports of your speech attacking the resolution.

The President has heard from me again and again, and I am writing to him once more.

Respectfully yours,

MOA BRAGIN.

NEW YORK, N.Y., August 8, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The special emergency meeting that sent the enclosed letter to President Johnson has asked me to convey to you their deep appreciation for your courageous stand and their support for your efforts.

They urge you to continue your outspoken attack on the present ruinous policies followed in southeast Asia. Many of the organizations represented have given this issue the highest priority on their agendas and will devote their energies and resources to the goal of an immediate cessation of military operations and a negotiated solution on terms that can bring a sound and durable peace to the area.

Sincerely,

CHARLES BLOOMSTEIN

(For the Ad Hoc Meeting on Vietnam).

AD HOC MEETING ON VIETNAM,

New York, N.Y., August 7, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: A hastily summoned meeting to discuss the critical developments in Vietnam brought together representatives of 20 voluntary organizations of American citizens. Their presence reflects the deep concern we all feel about these developments.

We wish to communicate to you our urgent conviction that the United States should take the initiative in negotiating a settlement that will end military operations, reduce the danger of large-scale war, and resolve this whole tragic conflict.

As a beginning, we hope that the U.S. agreement to the appearance of representatives of both North and South Vietnam before the Security Council means that this in fact will occur and that further efforts will be made to involve all interested parties in these discussions.

We are convinced that those who call for extension of the war to North Vietnam or China represents only a minority of the American people. The vast majority of your fellow citizens, we believe, profoundly desire the end of the conflict and the establishment of means of negotiation.

Several of our organizations have already taken action on this matter, and some of their statements have been communicated to you. For your information, we attach copies of those that have come to our attention.

Respectfully submitted by the individuals listed below. Organizational reference is for identification only, with the exception of those with asterisks who sign not as individuals but officially for their organizations:

Robert S. Browne, economist.

Betty Elkin, executive secretary, Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation.

Ruth D. Freeman, member of the national board, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

Alfred Hassler, executive secretary, Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Neil Haworth, executive secretary, Committee for Nonviolent Action.

William Huntington, director, Quaker United Nations Program.

Donald Keys, program director, National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

Joan E. Lewis, regional organizer, New York Student Peace Union.

\*David Livingston, president, District 65, Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Union, AFL-CIO.

A. J. Muste, chairman, Committee for Nonviolent Action.

Albert Reiner, member of national executive committee, Campus Americans for Democratic Action.

Raymond S. Rubinow, former n.g.o. representative at the United Nations.

Bayard Rustin, executive secretary, War Resisters League.

Emily Parker Simon, executive director, Committee for World Development and World Disarmament.

Carl Soule, executive secretary, Division of Peace and World Order, Methodist Office for the United Nations.

Norman Thomas, chairman, Post War World Council; cochairman, Turn Toward Peace.

Hyman Weber, attorney.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is with deep conviction that we commend you on your courageous stand on the President's resolution. We are shocked that a powerful country, such as we, continue to support dictators, even after the previous corrupt regimes in Vietnam. Have we forgotten to negotiate and debate about the critical issues of the day? It is unfortunate that your repeated warnings have not been heeded. It is unfortunate that we seldom hear or see the entirety of your speeches.

Today we received our La Wisp and were shocked that some people believe MLF is a new cigarette. Why isn't the public informed about this on TV or radio, particularly on "public discussion" programs on Sunday? Is our communications media failing us? We urge you in your courageous stand to oppose "sharing" our nuclear force with the West Germans and Nazis who are continuing to play roles in the Government. We are aware that Nazi Heusinger has had a permanent planning post in NATO. We know that Adenauer had a Nazi police guard with him when he visited in Texas and was later exposed on TV and thus recognized.

La Wisp informs us shockingly that a secret document will be forwarded without knowledge of the Congress, except the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Since our present law provides U.S. nuclear weapons must remain under U.S. jurisdiction, we urge you to introduce another resolution to reject this agreement for exchange of additional nuclear weapons agreement to NATO and/or individual nations.

We see in the papers that a \$150 million estate was left by General Thonariel, of Thailand, our ally. Also that \$50 million of this was found in various banks in Thailand. Pray, tell us why are we assisting Thailand? Were the people or the economy developed or are we just building military roads and bases?

We see that General Motors will be in partnership with an unnamed West German firm to build new tankers for 1970's with huge sums of our dollars. Another huge military connections bill was passed for overseas. We still remember the Dr. Spiegel expose of the scandal in West Germany during the "Ike" administration. When are going to start an economic miracle at home—here in the United States?

Concernedly yours,

ANGELO PRAMENKO,  
JENNIE PRAMENKO.

P.S.—Kindly place us on your mailing list. Thank you.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 7, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: This is just a note to express my deep respect for your undaunted position on the Vietnam issue. Very little truth is given to American people about what is happening in southeast Asia. As a specialist on Asia I have been closely watching the events there, and the unfortunate mess created by the American involvement.

You will be proud to know that many intellectuals I talked to agree with your position. We hope that your lonely position will not deter you from the constructive part you can play before we are all blown up in a mischievous holocaust.

With respect,

ROBERT J. H.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My husband and myself wish to congratulate you on your courageous and intelligent vote in the Senate against the resolution giving the President powers to use force in southeast Asia.

Your voice makes it easier for many people like us to continue to work for a saner and more peaceful foreign policy. Thank you, and wishing you better luck in the future, we are,

Very sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. JUDITH and ARNOLD FRIEDMAN.

UPPER MIDVALE, N.J.,  
August 8, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to express my profound appreciation for your "nay" vote and statement on the President's resolution asking congressional support for his military intervention against North Vietnam.

Your courage, in the face of so much opposition, is an inspiration to all those who want to express dissent from the status quo. Please let me know what I can do to aid you in this effort to preserve the peace.

Sincerely,

EUGENIA B. SHULMAN.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Senator MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May God bless you for the courageous stand which you have taken. What we need is for more men to take a stand for what they believe. This Nation needs to remember the golden rule, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." I strongly uphold you in your stand. I think that we ought to beat our swords into plowshares and think of war no more.

Respectfully yours,

FAITH J. PRITCHARD.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Senator MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May God bless you for the courageous stand which you have taken. What we need is for more men to take a stand for what they believe. This Nation needs to remember the golden rule, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." I strongly uphold you in your stand. I think that we ought to beat our swords into plowshares and think of war no more.

Respectfully yours,

EDITH E. CORDELL.

PRINCETON, N.J.,  
August 10, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your recent refusal to support President Johnson's actions in Vietnam is to be commended. I have been greatly impressed by your objectivity in assessing the crises in southeast Asia. If only there were more men with your abilities sitting with you in the Senate, perhaps the citizenry could spend less time fearing World War III.

I congratulate you for your courage and wisdom.

Respectfully,

Mrs. VIRGINIA DAVIDSON.

AUGUST 7, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: There are too few men in politics today who have your courage and conviction. As a private citizen, I have long objected to the U.S. position in Vietnam, and have done what little I could to change what I believe to be a fruitless and dangerous policy. I have often thought of writing to you concerning your refusal to

accept the false reports and the distorted political commentaries about what is going on in Vietnam. And now with your position during this last week, in the face of the growing war hysteria, you have moved me to write to you.

Carry on the fight and know that there are those who have not been impressed with the false impressions which have been created by irresponsible political and journalistic figures. Thank you for speaking out with courage, for as long as men like yourself can be found in politics this country can preserve and generate its ideals. As long as men like yourself continue to look at world politics without the blinders of self-righteous nationalism, we still have a chance.

Sincerely,

PHILLIP B. ZEIGLER.

MILLBRAE, CALIF.

AUGUST 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I am enclosing a copy of a letter I sent to the President, the Secretary of State, and several New York newspapers. I'm certain the newspapers won't publish this letter because they don't want the people to know that we are unfortunately the aggressors in Vietnam and not the Communists.

God bless you for being the American conscience and speaking out for justice and truth. It is a rare and courageous person who will speak out in a society that has become conformist in every area.

How I wish you were a candidate for the office of the Presidency of these United States. We need someone like you desperately.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. T. KAHN.

JAMAICA, N.Y.

AUGUST 6, 1964.

President LYNDON JOHNSON,  
White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Writing this letter is very painful to me because I am torn between my love of country and my devotion to truth and justice, plus my intense desire to see my fine 20-year-old son and all young people live out their lives in a normal manner. If die they must, let it at least be in defense of our country.

In far-off South Vietnam our boys are killing South Vietnamese and they are killing our boys. We are in this undeclared war against a tiny country whose people have never hurt us and who can't possibly be a threat to us even if they have a Communist government.

North Vietnam has been a Communist government for some years and hasn't bothered us. Furthermore, history teaches us that ideas cannot be fought with bullets, but only with a better idea.

We have a better idea—our democracy—but we don't use it. That's the only way we can win.

Instead of helping these people to form a democratic government we forced a series of bloody dictators on these unfortunate people. The result is that these people are fighting against our puppet government there, as well as our boys, whom we send in ever-increasing numbers to help these creatures stay in power.

The French fought these people for years and couldn't win. We have been losing too.

Now in desperation and to save face, in my opinion, we are in the process of extending the war to North Vietnam. This means that China will most likely come into the war as she will feel threatened by our coming so close to her border.

If China or Russia invaded our neighbor, Mexico, we certainly wouldn't stand by either. It is naive of us to think that China



19874

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - SENATE

August 20

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

will allow us on her borders. This could mean a third and perhaps last world war on earth.

We are told this war is to save the Vietnamese from communism. If this is so, we wouldn't be losing. It seems to me the Vietnamese don't want us to save them—they just want us to get out of their country. If the Vietnamese don't want communism let them fight against it, they haven't so far.

We have the United Nations to settle international disputes, but our Government doesn't use it for that purpose. First we make war on little countries then we go to the United Nations to explain our aggressions.

War today has become unthinkable. We must end this madness while there is still time.

Sincerely,

TILLIE KAHN.

ELIZABETH, N.J.,  
August 9, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was privileged to hear, on TV, part of your statements of opposition to present U.S. policy in Asia. I want to congratulate you for having the courage, guts, and level-headedness to stand up and state the truth, in the face of so many opponents. You are absolutely right, and I want you to know that what you said expresses my thoughts and feelings, too. You certainly do represent me. It was thrilling to hear a sane man speak, for a change.

My personal feelings with regard to the war in Vietnam are these: The whole action was wrong in the first place. The United States is not an international policeman to go into other people's houses and stop them from having fights, and overthrowing their rulers, if they want to. They know more about their own leaders, good and bad, than we do, and what policies they want to follow. Who gave us the right to dictate to them?

The Lodges, and Dulles' have done nothing but get this country into trouble, and get us hated and feared all over the world. Old John Foster Dulles with his brinkmanship, and now another one; and now Henry Cabot Lodge's personal war in Vietnam. Who are we kidding? Lodge, Rusk, McNamara, and McCone are the only ones whose prestige would be hurt (the poor things would lose face) if this senseless war in Vietnam were stopped, as it should be, right now. My prestige certainly wouldn't be hurt, nor that of any other sensible person; and after all, they are supposed to be carrying out our wishes (this is a democracy, remember?) not dictating to us, what they will do.

As you said, the President, nor any small select group in the Pentagon or the CIA has the right to just go ahead and wage war on any nation, without first getting the approval of Congress—House and Senate. That is in the Constitution. Furthermore, on an issue as important as this, in a nuclear age, the question should be taken to the people themselves, so we can vote on whether somebody's "prestige image" is worth our getting atomically destroyed over.

Those aforementioned men have been trying, through one subterfuge or another (and succeeding pretty well, too) to circumvent the legal, lawful ways of doing things in this country, and have a "do it yourself" government by them, independent of us, long enough. The time to stop those egomaniacs is right now.

I, and all the thousands of other people who are against the Vietnam war are not going to be silenced or swept under the rug. They can pretend there's no opposition to this thing all they want to, but there is opposition, and they're going to be in for a rude shock if they keep on.

McNamara is a bigot. He spoke on TV about things that he couldn't "get across" to "these people," referring to Asians. Their mentality was "different," their thinking was "different." The "these people" is a key, to anyone who knows how prejudiced people regard Negroes, or anyone else not of their race. It is as though they were totally alien; there is no identification with "these people," or "you people." It's a dead giveaway. The reason is simple. If they only once put themselves in the position of the other person, then the other person's thinking would be perfectly comprehensible. But this, a bigot absolutely refuses to do. He refuses to ascribe the same feelings of pride and independence to a person of another race, that he reserves for himself. Thinking thusly, he is frustrated and angered when the other person refuses to allow him to decide what's best for them, or bend to the imposition of his will over theirs. The Bible calls it false pride. We call it ego or prestige.

A racial bigot like McNamara is so convinced that he knows what's best for the rest of the world, that he's ready to blow "these people" up, if they won't do what he says. Their "stubborn" refusal to obey him, has caused him to "blow his top," therefore he will blow them up in retaliation. But that's him. He doesn't represent or speak for the rest of us. We say, they have the same right to live out their lives in peace, free from our interference, as we expect from them. Their blood is on his head and hands. As a citizen of this country, however, I share in this country's guilt for overseas murders, and hereby, in the only way I know how to, I register my disapproval and opposition to the war in Vietnam. Henry Cabot Lodge's war, not mine.

Now as far as the "binding treaties" talk: that is the greatest farce of all. We sign a "treaty" with a certain ruling group or faction that we convince to see things "our way"; then when they wise up, and want to change their minds, or are pressured by their people to break the "treaty," CIA assassins move in to engineer their murder, and we perpetuate the "treaty" with a new leader or group. It takes two parties to make a contract binding, but whenever the other persons want to break an "agreement" with us, however disastrous for them, we won't hear of it. Is this fair or just?

To me, this resembles a man who has married a woman. Sure, he has a marriage contract, and has pledged to "love, honor, and protect" her. However, if she finds herself abused by him, being made a fool of, and enslaved, she may decide she doesn't want his "love and protection" any more. She wants to be free of him—to break the marriage contract.

He, however, refuses to give her a divorce, continues to claim his "rights," reminding her of their marriage contract, and if she tries to leave him, bullies and beats her up. How valid is his case? He maintains his right to "protect" her, but who is going to protect her against him? If he continues to refuse to get out and leave her alone, she might have to call upon another man, who is stronger, to help her obtain her freedom from the unwanted contractual "bondage." This, to me, typifies exactly the U.S. position in Vietnam.

The same can be said of the U.S. "treaty" with Panama. They want to break it; we won't let them. An international bully, the United States has become.

The Cyprus situation, however, really caps the climax. We scream to Cyprus: "Don't do as we do; do as we tell you." If the situation wasn't so serious, it would be funny. North Vietnam, a pygmy, steps on the corns of the mighty United States of America. Powerful United States retaliates by kicking them in the pants, blackening their eyes, and knocking their teeth out. Hooray for us. When Turkey follows our example, and mas-

sively retaliates against Greek Cypriots, we holler, "Stop that fighting. You mustn't do what we did." Do you think we have provided any good moral example? People judge you by what you do; not by what you say. Don't you agree? Thank you for reading this letter.

Here is a poem inspired by the enclosed article, before the Cyprus trouble erupted:

## LOVE CONQUERS ALL

He was Greek, and she a Turk—  
Friends said it would never work;  
Still, she nearly drove him daft,  
Had to have his Turkish taffy.

Just one way to break the barrier,  
He just up, and had to marry her;  
Now the two are gaily blended,  
And the Cyprus war is ended.

—ELEANOR PEREZ.

Well, it's a nice thought, anyway, don't you think?

Sincerely,

ELEANOR PEREZ.

P.S.—Those Turks must be terrific lovers.

AUGUST 10, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: A copy of enclosed telegram was sent to each Senator listed: Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, Senator PIERRE SALINGER, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, and Senator HUMPHREY.

Thank you for your efforts toward world peace.

Sincerely yours,

MARK FEIGER.

AUGUST 10, 1964.

We urge you to support Senator WAYNE MORSE for a negotiated peace in southeast Asia.

Mr. and Mrs. MARK FEIGER.  
LAKEWOOD, CALIF.

SAN PEDRO, CALIF.,  
August 8, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR: We have read your articles on Vietnam and heard your stand on the recent Vietnam crisis.

We are with you in full agreement and wish to commend you for your integrity.

May we ask you to stand firm?

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. T. N. QUINN, Jr.

ALTADENA, CALIF.,  
August 10, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I desire to congratulate you on your "No" vote on the recent recent resolution to extend the war in Vietnam.

Must the United States support that Castro-type South Vietnamese dictator, complete even to the goat, already a millionaire from U.S. aid money?

Sincerely,

PRESTON D. OREM.

WELLFLEET, MASS.,  
August 10, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
The Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In this age of instant anxiety and blind brinkmanship, we must tell you how grateful we are for your sane voice raised in lonely defense of reality and constitutionality.

After Korea, the United States should have learned that war must never again be declared by blanket resolution in defiance of our Constitution. Furthermore, war should never again be declared by any country. In

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

JACKSON HEIGHTS, N.Y.  
August 9, 1964.

this nuclear era, war has become impossible as a means of solution to any problem.

Like it or not, negotiations, conferences, and intelligent compromise have become the only weapons with which any nation can defend itself. The alternative is annihilation of all nations, the principled together with the unprincipled, the guilty and the innocent.

We thank you and Senator GRUENING for recognizing this hard fact and we urge you to continue to fight the most important battle of our time—the battle for survival. Whether they know it now or not, the American people are behind you if only because they have nothing to gain and everything to lose from a nuclear war.

And when history is written (if our earth endures long enough for history to be written), your name will be proudly remembered when the names of those who voted so shamefully are long forgotten.

Very sincerely yours,

NED and JANE LEHAC.

(Copies to President Lyndon B. Johnson, Senator Ernest Gruening, Senator Leverett Saltonstall, Senator Edward Kennedy, Representative Hastings Keith.)

AUGUST 10, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I cannot too strongly commend you or your stand on the Vietnam situation, and, for that matter, on all of the positions you have taken on the crucial issue of peace in the world.

I hope you will not be discouraged by the seeming lack of support on the part of the people of the United States. We are so inarticulate but there is a great desire for peace and I don't know what we would do if we did not have your strong voice in the Congress.

Sincerely,

KATHERINE GWATHMEY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

SKOKIE, ILL.,  
August 8, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please allow us to express our gratitude for the courage you displayed in voting against the Johnson "war" resolution, and for your singlehanded fight against our involvement in Vietnam.

We agree wholeheartedly with you that the whole Vietnam adventure is dangerous and immoral, and can lead our country into a tragic debacle.

We hope you will persist in exposing this terrible mistake.

Yours sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. H. L. SANDERS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 10, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Am very grateful to you for voicing your strong disapproval of our escalating our involvement in South Vietnam. Our unilateral action in carrying the war into North Vietnam is fraught with danger and can only result in more and more lives being lost.

It would seem that the only possible alternative is another Geneva conference and an earnest effort by all parties concerned to arrive at a peaceful solution. More and more bloodshed never resolved anything.

Thank you again for your forthright stand.

Respectfully yours,

HELEN LEMBERG.

P.S.—Have wired the above sentiments to President Johnson.

No. 164—4

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Bravo. I feel that I must tell you I agree wholeheartedly with your statement regarding Vietnam.

You are one of the few honest and brave men in our country today.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Mrs. REGINA LERNER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
August 9, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to urge open hearings and debate on President Johnson's proposal to give nuclear weapons secrets to NATO countries through MLF. I am opposed to the spread of nuclear weapons to any country, and especially to Germany, West, or East.

I would like also to commend you on your minority vote in the Vietnam crisis.

Sincerely,

FLORIDA FRIEBUS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
August 9, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORRIS:

I wish to express my congratulations for your courageous stand you have taken on the question of Vietnam.

Respectfully yours,

SAM KUGLER.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,  
August 10, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I express my gratitude for your stand on Vietnam and my congratulations for your courage in casting one of the two negative votes on the President's resolution.

I have written Senators FULBRIGHT and CLARK urging them even at this late date, to work for cease-fire pending discussion at the U.N. and negotiation looking toward a neutralized and demilitarized southeast Asia.

Respectfully,

LUCY P. CARNER.

CRANFORD, N.J.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My sincerest best wishes and deepest respect go out to you for your vote in the Senate against President Johnson's carte blanche resolution on Vietnam.

If only a few others would raise their voices.

Again, thank you.

LESTER GOLDBERG.

AUGUST 8, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please allow me to express my agreement and admiration of your efforts to counter the political policies and military actions that our country has followed in South Vietnam.

I heartily approve of your vote against the extension of the war in southeast Asia. It seems horribly tragic that debate on such matters has been overridden by blind conformity at every level in the country.

I observe, however, that despite an unquestioning acceptance of all political and military policies carried out by the Government, that persons of my acquaintance generally desire peace and are quite fearful of a little

war that might escalate into a world war. In this respect, I feel that your opposition to the military adventures in southeast Asia, has wide support.

I urge you to continue to fight against the further extension of military action in a war that apparently no one except the U.S. Defense Department is really anxious to fight.

Respectfully yours,

HAROLD SCHARF.

NEW PALTZ, N.Y.

EAST LONGMEADOW, MASS.,  
August 9, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to express our thanks for your efforts to prevent the spread of the war in Southeast Asia and to bring about the eventual withdrawal of American military forces.

Please continue to do what you can to influence our Government's policy and to keep us from further war.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. HERBERT POMEROY.

HANOVER, N.H.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been following your remarks on Vietnam with interest, and would like to take this opportunity to say that I agree with the positions you have taken. I have previously written the President, and my own Senators (CASE and WILLIAMS, from New Jersey) urging a neutralized South Vietnam and a negotiated U.S. withdrawal—but obviously to no avail.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR FORER.

AUGUST 8, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This letter is to thank you for having the courage to vote against the President's request for permission to take whatever steps he wished in the Vietnam situation.

While on this issue you stood almost alone in the Senate, I am sure that you spoke for millions of Americans who continue to feel that we should be seeking a negotiated settlement rather than a military solution to the problem.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. SCHUDER.

COLUMBIA, MO.

MARION, OHIO,  
August 7, 1964.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I would like to congratulate you for the stand you took against the resolution backing President Johnson's dangerous military actions in southeast Asia.

I have admired your position on several different issues in the past and appreciate the fact that you vote for what you feel is right and just and not for what is political expedient.

I am sure this makes you a very lone man times, but I hope that you keep it up, even so the majority is against you many times.

Maybe with Senators such as you we will be able to preserve peace and do as a country what is right.

Respectfully yours,

OSWALD F. MERZ.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 7, 1964.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am very pleased and encouraged by your stand on the U.S. position in Vietnam.

When all the false standards of face saving and revenge are eliminated it is so ob-

19876

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD SENATE

August 20

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

vicious that the area in question should be neutralized and we should be out.

I hope your voice will be strong enough to carry to the people to prevent the Government from prodding the opposition to a major war.

I am sure your sentiments are shared more by the people than by our colleagues.

Sincerely,

MORT JUNGER.

EASTON CONN.,

August 10, 1964.

Senator MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks a million for your defense of the human race. Both you and Senator GRAVENING deserve accolade for your work in trying to save the world from its last final fling.

More power to you Senator.

"They are slaves who fear to speak,  
For the fallen and the weak  
They are slaves who will not choose  
Hatred, scoffing and abuse  
Rather than in silence shrink  
From the truth the needs must think  
They are slaves who dare not be  
For the right with two or three."

—JAMES RUSSEL LOWELL.

Sincerely,

ABRAHAM YOUNG.

AUGUST 6, 1964.

DEAR SIR: I only wished I could find an expression of my sincere admiration for you in words and convey them.

Your help in making H.R. 1829 a decent bill is one aspect of your humane endeavor, but especially today—after reading your protest against American aggression in Vietnam, North and South—I cannot help but write this letter in gratitude that the power structure of political opportunists has left enough room for the courage, intelligence, and humaneness of a man like yourself.

In hope for your (our) victory.

MARKET. KIMBRELL.

MADISON, Wis.,

August 5, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am a graduate student in American history here at Wisconsin. For the past several years you have been my political idol. As I interviewed many old La Follette progressives for the Wisconsin Historical Society, I was amazed to find the large numbers of them who share my respect for you.

It is not domestic affairs but foreign policy which prompts this note. After reading your speech calling for reductions in aid before crucial reforms are enacted, I told my wife that I wanted to let you know that at least some people agree with you. Then, yesterday, when L.B.J. ordered the attack on North Vietnam, I wondered what MORSE would say. Stupid me. I should have expected to find you on the right side, as you were. So now I write to applaud both of your statements. Your mail is doubtless 100 to 1 against you, but someone must be that 1.

You are probably familiar with the critiques of American foreign policy offered by William Appleman Williams, who formerly taught at the great University of Oregon. I suspect that when (and if) we can get some perspective on this anti-communism smokescreen, historians will record MORSE as the prophet without honor. When we come to see that money doesn't buy friends (has it ever?), that different nations at different times have needs for different types of economic systems—that "freedom" and "communism" and right and wrong are not the same thing, that the Communist world is as divided as the "free world," that there is little difference between one imperialism and another, etc., then we shall start listening to MORSE.

I have just two questions, both academic, about our foreign policy. How can we provide the capital which emerging nations need (and presumably want) without getting into the bind of insisting that they adopt our definition of the proper social order? Why must we insist that they be of strategic use in the "fight against communism" before we offer money? Would an emerging nation be willing to accept private loans from American banks, as we accepted them from European nations during our industrial infancy? Are these emerging nations able to evolve entrepreneurial classes before we skin off the profits from their raw materials? My second question is sort of silly: How can we, Mr. and Mrs. Grassroots, do something to help make our policymakers and our fellow citizens realize that there are other issues in foreign policy besides freedom and communism, and that this issue is clouding our perspective. Having defined our policy in these terms, when we are unable to win any major victories, we must inevitably produce Goldwaters who play on our obvious failure to achieve victory.

I have a request, too. Could you put me on your mailing list for your newsletter, if you have one, and send along copies of your speeches on foreign affairs, particularly the last two—one on the need for reform in foreign aid and the one which finds the United States as guilty as North Vietnam for the present mess? The Milwaukee Journal attempted to summarize them, but I want to see your whole argument. I'm sorry I'm not one of your constituents, but I regard you as my voice in Washington.

Thank you very kindly.

Sincerely,

DAVID THELEN.

PARAMOUNT, CALIF.,

August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: What documents can you quote to support your contention that the United States is a provocator in southeast Asia? Where and how can I obtain copies of these documents?

Could you shed some light upon the real reason why the United States is involved in southeast Asia?

Very truly yours,

HARRY E. MONNIER.

AUGUST 9, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was proud of your great courage in standing up for what you thought right in this present crisis.

It seems to me that the Goldwater candidacy has created pressures that finally tempted Johnson to some action. I still feel we peace people have to wind up voting for Johnson on the basis of his being better than GOLDWATER. But these surely are sad days.

I would very much like to get copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS that contained your speeches on the crisis.

I am a Minnesota University law grad and once visited you in Eugene when I was cut looking for a location to practice law in about 1936.

Cordially,

W. E. FLYMAL.

P.S.—I wound up as president of an insurance company I organized.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

August 8, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senator ERNEST GRUENING,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Thank you Senators for your protest voiced in the Senate yesterday against the aggressive actions of the Johnson administration in southeast Asia. It is said indeed

that there were only two of you but I am confident that the silent masses throughout this planet are with you if only they are allowed by the propaganda mass media to hear and read what you had to say.

There comes to mind the names of a few other Senators—old Bob LaFollette, the great man from Nebraska, George W. Norris, Edgar Borah from Idaho. They stood alone denounced by the press, and hysterical, cowardly politicians.

But history proved them right and today there statues occupy places of honor and distinction in the Halls of Congress. And the generations to come and history will honor you for what you said yesterday in the Halls of Congress.

By the way Senator MORSE only two short paragraphs of your 1 hour and 40 minute speech appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle this morning, a paper that boasts the largest circulation in northern California.

Will you oblige me with copies of your speeches?

Most sincerely,

HERMAN STUYVELAAR.

NORWALK, OHIO,

August 6, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senator, U.S. Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We write you to commend you for your courage and independence of mind in the stand you have taken on the affairs of the attack made by our Armed Forces on the PT bases in North Vietnam. We also wish to assure you that on this issue we stand foursquare with you.

Will you please send us copies of the speeches that you and some of your colleagues have made in the Senate on the entire subject of Vietnam?

Yours with many thanks,

BARNES C. GRAHAM.

Mrs. ALENE M. GRAHAM.

CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY

CHURCH OF MARHAM,

MARKHAM, ILL.,

August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Would you please send me available copies of your addresses and public pronouncements on Vietnam?

We are grateful for your courageous mind and voice lifted up in this time of tragic moral confusion and conformity. May God give you strength to continue.

Respectfully,

Rev. T. W. SIMER.

MARKHAM, ILL.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

August 8, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Heartfelt thanks and admiration for your courageous stand on the southeast Asia resolution. I still remember gratefully your similar stand (with Herbert Lehman) on the Formosa resolution in 1955. The people and the historians of the future will remember what you have done. I hope that at least it will be possible to carry the issue of constitutionality further, since the people of this country are deprived of their right to determine their own life and death destinies. And also that the intent of the Nelson resolution will be respected by the administration, as indicated by Senator FULLBRIGHT.

As I had written to you earlier, with the profound hold of Buddhism over the large majority of people in that area and their disbelief in violence as well as positions of so-called overwhelming strength, there is no chance of a victory which I hope the ad-

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

1964

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

ministration may be made to see after the election.

I should appreciate it if you would be good enough to send me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday's debate as well as your own speeches on the Vietnam issue during the last week.

May I recall by way of personal introduction that I met you when I was teaching at Columbia.

Yours gratefully and respectfully,  
ERNEST DALE,  
Professor, the University of Virginia.

VALEJO, CALIF.,  
August 4, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senator from Oregon,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: In the April 6 issue of I. F. Stone's Weekly a section is abridged from your March 25 speech in the Senate on South Vietnam.

The Weekly states in its abridgement: "We are there we say at the invitation of the South Vietnamese Government. But that Government is our own creature. We know it and the world knows it. One might as well try to claim that the Soviet Army is in East Germany only at the invitation of the East German Government."

It continues further on in the article: "There are no Chinese soldiers fighting in Vietnam; there are no Russian soldiers. The only foreign troops are Americans. Every time an American dies in Vietnam, the flag should be lowered to half mast over the Capitol, over the White House, over the Pentagon because boys are dying in the execution of a unilateral policy that no longer has a direct bearing on the defenses of the United States."

If this is the correct sense of your Senate speech, it is a severe indictment of U.S. action in South Vietnam.

I. F. Stone, himself, speaking on KPFA radio (a listener-supported radio station in Berkeley, Calif.) stated that news correspondents from other countries covering South Vietnam found that of all the arms recovered from the Vietcong, a vast majority were United States made and only a small proportion were made in Communist China. If this is so, it makes talk of taking the war north irrelevant if not dangerous. The above-noted observation indicates further, I think, that the fighting is a revolution internal to South Vietnam; the U.S. arms were stolen by the Vietcong from South Vietnamese.

Statements such as the above, by responsible citizens such as you and Mr. Stone, have raised grave doubts in my mind as to the justice of U.S. actions in South Vietnam. Doubtful though I may be and respectful of your opinions, sir, I find myself with a scarcity of facts to substantiate criticism of the administration's present course of action.

I would very much appreciate it if your office would send me a statement of your own on the South Vietnam action and of what are the true U.S. interests in the area. In addition I would like a catalog of the hard facts (along with independent sources) by which you document your view and the reasoning behind it.

If I find the documentation adequate, I will be glad to join you "out on (your) limb" and, in my small capacity as a citizen, I will help you in any way I can.

Very truly yours,

JOHN P. WEBBER.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,  
August 8, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I should like first of all to express my gratitude and admiration for the courageous stand you have con-

sistently taken against the aggressive foreign policies of this country. How it is that you are virtually the sole person in the Senate who has not made himself a stooge for the Military Establishment and the business community I do not know, but your lone dissent has my full support.

I am a student at the Harvard Graduate School in the field of Soviet studies. I am planning to do an analytic and interpretative study of U.S. policy in Vietnam, and I shall endeavor to place this in the full historical context of American policy in Asia. Since, however, my major objective is to elucidate the real nature of what is going on in that part of the world today and what is likely to happen in the near future, I am very much concerned with the serious difficulties which one faces in obtaining reliable information. The recent crisis was enormously frustrating to one who refuses to accept the veracity of official Government statements and explanations.

Since the American Government has quite consistently and deliberately lied to the American people with regard to matters concerning Indochina, and since you alone have sought to counter this deception, it seemed useful for me to find out if you could provide me with any information. Your membership on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and your deep concern with developments in Indochina have no doubt made you one of the best informed persons in these matters.

I should like to know, therefore, if there is any information which you could send me and which it would be permissible for me to quote, including any specific remarks which you yourself might care to make. I am particularly interested in the extent to which the United States and our South Vietnamese puppets have been carrying out air attacks, dropping sabotage teams, supporting naval attacks, etc., on North Vietnamese territory. Also, do you have official information relevant to the myth of North Vietnamese and Chinese aggression, infiltration, and supplying of arms and men? I have followed most, if not all, of your remarks which have found their way into the newspapers, including more sympathetic publications, such as I. F. Stone's Weekly.

Thank you very much for whatever additional information with which you can provide me, and thank you again for your voice of dissent against the increasingly dangerous policies of the American Government.

Sincerely,

STEVEN J. ROSENTHAL.

COSTA MESA, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are certainly to be congratulated on your splendid stand for right as you have drawn so clearly the picture of the southeast Asian problem.

The people (meaning the man or woman on the street) are not well informed with regard to most of today's crisis situations. Nor are we thoroughly informed as to your position. But, it is the thought of some of us that you have objected to the military giveaway—the interference on our part in a war that we cannot win, etc.

Many of us feel that the whole of southeast Asia should be neutralized and that the U.N. should have a firm hand. We hope for the reconvening of the Geneva Conference. We feel that the policy started by Dulles and carried on in support of the corrupt Diem regime was totally bankrupt, and we feel the same way about Khan. We deplore the strategic hamlets, the abuse of the people, and the no-win, wasteful situation, as we see it.

You may not agree at all, but De Gaulle has, to the way of many people's thinking,

offered some ideas worth considering out there.

More than all else, today, we believe that U Thant is the wise one. We believe that you and Senator GRUENING have taken a less warlike position, and we feel that a third world war is the destruction of civilization. We deplore the quick money for arms and feel that negotiation—use of the U.N., etc.—are the wise moves. Walter Lippmann always stands tall.

On foreign aid, many of us would see technical help, an expansion of the Peace Corps. In place of the military (except for genuine internal security), we would see schools, hospitals, roads, dams, help to the people. That would be a "win" policy, whether done at home or abroad.

Mr. MORSE, will you please send a dozen of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD sheets, showing your position, that I may put them in the hands of responsible people?

Thank you.

ANGINETTE SHERMAN GORES.

RIALTO, CALIF.,  
August 5, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: I always used to impress with your views, because regardless of party affiliations, all other needs of conformity, I think you are one of those who says what he thinks.

It is impossible to get full text of your speech on Vietnam, which must include lot of facts press and TV decline to tell or print.

If possible I like to have full text of your speech on Vietnam you gave on August 5.

Because of my knowledge of history of Vietnam since 15th century and United States, French, and Vietnamese relations before Dienbienphu and since I see not much moral base on U.S. arguments about independence of South Vietnam.

U.S. position in South Vietnam as similar to those Russian position in Hungary.

United States paid \$2.7 billion to French to kill Vietnamese when their only crime was to fight to kick French out of their country, yet United States did not mind to gave Ho Chi Minh and Pathet Lao when they were fighting against Japanese.

After World War II over, despite of those loose talk about Four Freedoms, Atlantic Charter and all those freedom nonsense French did not mind to grab those lands back, with approval of United States of course.

Before Bao Dai and after moral position of United States was vulnerable at Vietnam, especially unkept parts of Geneva agreement on Vietnam, when United States stayed out, after Mendes France said put up or shut up to Dulles, when they were beaten at Dien Bien Phu by Pathet Lao and Ho Chi Minh and Vo Nguyen Glap.

It is nice to see that there are men like you still existing, when heads are hot, it takes guts to criticize oneself.

Sincerely,

HALIL S. GURELLI,  
Turkish Student.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to confirm today's telegram wishing you courage in the continuing fight against our policy in Vietnam which inevitably leads to war.

Enclosed, too, are copies of wires I have sent to my two Senators.

It would be helpful to me in talking with friends and neighbors to have any available copies of transcripts of the talks you have been making on this question. Truthfully, I had given but passing attention to the inconspicuous newspaper reports of your speeches. But shocked as I was by the President's message on Tuesday night, and the

19878

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 20

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

subsequent developments, I was overjoyed when I saw and heard you on TV this morning. It bolstered my hope and my determination to see that you are there and still fighting in the face of this veritable landslide of war incitement.

Keep up the good fight. I am sure there are many like myself who want to help in any small way we can.

Sincerely,

CLARA COLÓN.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,  
August 6, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: It is not my custom to dash off letters to public officials at the drop of a hat. But since hearing your message to us fellow Americans last Tuesday night, I have not had a moment's peace of mind. When you said that our planes at that moment were in action, I shuddered remembering the nightmare of the Korean war behind us and aghast at the possibility of nuclear war ahead of us. As every passing hour brings new efforts through radio, TV, and the papers to raise a war fever, I am increasingly alarmed. I could not go to work this morning before writing to you.

If we are indeed a country whose Government exercises power by consent of the governed, I must in good conscience raise my small voice to declare I do not consent to your message of Tuesday night, nor your speech at Syracuse, nor Ambassador Stevenson's presentation at the U.N. Security Council yesterday, nor the joint resolution being debated in Congress today. And I have so wired to my Senators.

Without any hesitation I am ready to make every sacrifice for the genuine defense of my country. But I am convinced that my country is in no way threatened by North Vietnam's PT boats in the Gulf of Tonkin. At this moment, incited by publicity, many people may be horrified by an "unprovoked" attack upon our destroyers. But these same people, if furnished more information and given a chance to really judge, would probably join me in asking, "What are our destroyers doing there in the first place?" Why have we let our Government get into the business of upholding one corrupt and shaky regime after another, none of which have enjoyed the confidence of its own people? Wasn't the experience of France, and its inevitable debacle at Dien Bien Phu lesson enough for us? Do we have to step into France's outworn colonialist shoes? And at what cost to us taxpayers?

You seemed to take pride and comfort, Mr. President, in the fact that Senator BARRY GOLDWATER supports your conduct in the Vietnam situation. I am frankly shocked. It was bad enough to see a candidate of Senator GOLDWATER's extremist views nominated by a major political party, but at least we had the alternative of supporting a mature, forward-looking, thoughtful, reasoning leader in the other party. Do you not realize there is no statesmanship in capitulating to Senator GOLDWATER's brinkmanship?

Let me refer again to the astronomical cost of our Vietnam policy. How can we keep on spending billions in support of a dubious "freedom" in Vietnam (which the majority of people in Vietnam reject) at the cost of building the foundation for real freedom for the Negro 20 percent of our citizens here at home? Just imagine what effective application could be given to both the civil rights law and the antipoverty program if the funds now used for a false defense of freedom in Vietnam were allocated to a real defense of freedom at home in the form of job opportunities, job training, quality education in integrated schools, slum clearance and new low-rent housing. This would be of tremendous benefit not

only to the underprivileged of all races but to the whole population, and especially to the Negro people as well as the Puerto Rican and Mexican-American minorities.

President Johnson, many of your fellow citizens hope you will have the courage and the bigness to recognize the error of your policy on Vietnam (which is a result of the unfortunate policies you inherited from previous administrations) and will withdraw the joint resolution, pull out our Armed Forces from that area and give the people of Vietnam the liberty to solve their own problems in their own way.

Respectfully and sincerely,

CLARA COLÓN.

AUGUST 6, 1964.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

For sake of peace please vote against resolution giving President power to declare instant war.

CLARA COLÓN.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

AUGUST 6, 1964.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

To preserve peace urge vote against resolution tantamount declaration of war.

CLARA COLÓN.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

CHICAGO, ILL.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It takes guts to take the stand you did on the NBC program this evening. Your courage and integrity in pointing out our violations of the Geneva agreement are exemplary. We have read an abridged version of your speech to the Senate on June 23. Please send us a copy of the entire speech. We heartily concur in your statement, "Before any administration threatens to take the United States into war it should exhaust the last possibility to avoid it." We can hardly believe that bombing bases in North Vietnam fits into this possibility. Apparently we have learned nothing from the disaster that befell the French in Indochina, and by escalating the war we may all of us "pay the uttermost farthing."

Cordially,

Dr. and Mrs. ALFRED STEIN.

EVANSVILLE COLLEGE,  
Evansville, Ind.,  
August 6, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE C. MORSE,  
Senator from Oregon,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations upon your forthright affirmation of sound moral truth in the midst of the belligerent nationalistic spirit of the day.

The radio and television reports have given only partial extracts of what you said, however, but by putting together what each of the three networks quoted I suppose we have a fair representation of what you really said.

If it is possible to have a copy of these statements and of other statements that you will make in the near future, I shall be very grateful to be on your mailing list for such materials. Some of the materials will be directly useful in my teaching of a course in ethics, and the rest will be interesting and morale-boosting for me to have personally.

Thank you. With all good wishes, I am,  
Sincerely yours,

HARRIS D. ERICKSON,  
Professor of Philosophy.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,  
August 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Were your remarks regarding the situation in south Asia extended into the RECORD? If so I would appreciate a copy.

At least there some Senators who are concerned about sending our boys to war.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD J. WAGNER.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

BURLINGTON, VT.,  
August 5, 1964.

WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senator,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on all your past speeches on the errors of our foreign policy in southeast Asia. All our citizens owe you a debt today for the courageous way in which you expressed the "nagging doubts" which many of us feel over President Johnson's decision to attack military installations in North Vietnam when our fleet was in no immediate danger. I would like very much to have copies of any of your speeches on this topic which may be available. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. SPINNER, JR.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
August 5, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I fully agree with your position on refusal to agree with the resolution on engagement in North Vietnam. The parents of all children should be grateful that there is at least one Senator who can expose the on-sided argument of President Johnson to engage in aggressive war.

Please send me your entire speeches on this vital issue before the Senate now. What can the people do when all the news media are controlled? Even the proceedings of the U.N. weren't carried in its entirety here in Los Angeles. What can be done to make these channels open to the public?

Yours truly,

JOSEPH SIEGEL.

MISADVENTURE IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Misadventure in Vietnam: The Mix of Fact and Myth," written by John Gange, and published in Nation magazine for August 24, 1964.

John Gange is director of the Institute of International Studies and Overseas Administration, of the University of Oregon. He served for some years as an officer in the State Department. I am proud to ask unanimous consent that this scholarly article by an outstanding professor at the University of Oregon be printed in the RECORD. His scholarship has won for him a high reputation.

If one will read Mr. Gange's article, entitled "Misadventure in Vietnam: The Mix of Fact and Myth," he will find further substantiation of the criticisms of U.S. warmaking policies in Asia that the junior Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRUENING) and the senior Senator from Oregon have been presenting on the floor of the Senate for the past 6 months. They will find ample support for the position of the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Oregon in refusing to vote for a joint resolution which, as we said at the time, constitutes a predated declaration of war, giving to the President, in clear

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1



Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

violation of the Constitution, the right to make war in the absence of a declaration of war.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a second article published in the Nation magazine for August 24, 1964, this one entitled "The Only War We've Got." It was written by Daniel F. Ford. Mr. Ford, a freelance journalist, has been in South Vietnam for the past 2 months on a magazine writer's grant from the Philip M. Stern Family Fund. This is the last article in a series he has written for the Nation from this most unfortunate war zone, in the creation of which the United States, since 1954, will have to assume a large share of the responsibility and burden in the pages of history.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MISADVENTURE IN VIETNAM—THE MIX OF  
FACT AND MYTH  
(By John Gange)

The weathered headstones in the old Protestant cemetery of Portuguese Macao tell of the misadventures of many Americans in the Gulf of Tonkin and the South China Sea. In the early years of our Republic, the Americans who died in this faraway area were sailors, Yankee traders, missionaries, and visionary diplomats—like Edmund Roberts, who first sought treaties for the United States in southeast Asia, journeying to Cochinchina, Siam, and Muscat in 1832. Today, the headlines toll the death of many Americans pursuing the political interests of the United States in southeast Asia.

From small beginnings our interest in southeast Asia swelled to include a colonial empire highlighted by our half century in the Philippines. The United States blundered into empire in 1898 by defeating the weak Spanish imperialists in the Battle of Manila Bay. Now we are fighting again in the Gulf of Tonkin and in the steaming jungle of old Indochina. For many Americans today our deep involvement in southeast Asia's civil wars is as inexplicable as was our plunge into empire in the Philippines. For 14 years we have propped the French effort to keep Indochina, or have underwritten the "democratic" regimes of such as Bao Dai, Ngo Dinh Diem and the subsequent military dictators. We have stumbled into "colonial" responsibilities without corresponding authority since the defeat of France by the Vietnamese in 1954.

The dilemma we faced in mid-1954 was very different in some respects from the dilemma President McKinley faced in 1898 when he was informed that all of the Philippine Islands were ours for the taking—and holding. In 1954, there was nothing ready for the taking in Indochina—unless we were prepared to battle the well-armed, well-led and tough Vietnamese and almost certainly the colossus of Communist China. We nevertheless decided to try to hold South Vietnam against a Communist takeover.

In doing so we underestimated Communist power and the response of great numbers of the Vietnamese to Ho Chi Minh's leadership, plus the extent of Communist outside aid, especially from the Chinese. When Secretary Dulles went to the Geneva Conference of April 1954, called to discuss Korea and dispose of the pieces of the broken French empire in Indochina, reportedly he refused to look at the chief Communist Chinese delegate, Premier Chou En-lai. This news sparked one of Fletcher Knebel's best quips to the effect that the Republicans were an odd lot, for Senator Joseph R. McCarthy saw Communists where they did not exist, and Secretary Dulles couldn't see them where

they did exist. And that was the source of our trouble: the refusal to look at facts which we dislike and hope will go away.

It has taken the French, through the voice of General de Gaulle, to tell us that no settlement of any Asian problem is possible that doesn't take Communist China fully into account. The British recognized this fact in 1950 but they have not been so blunt in asserting its validity. Americans have not dealt with a strong, unified China since 1842, when the British forced the opening of several Chinese ports to Western trade with various related privileges. In 1844, we got our treaty with China, including trading rights and extraterritorial courts for our citizens in China. This period of wars with the West marked the end of a strong China for a hundred years. It is time we now adjusted ourselves to the fact of a new China. Is this hard to accept? Indeed it is, and for a long time we will no doubt fight this gross fact of our times. Eventually, it will have to be accepted and it must henceforth be included in the ingredients that shape our Asian policy.

In 1954, we chose not to join in the final declaration of the Geneva Conference on Indochina of July 21, 1954. (The United States made a unilateral statement, however, accepting the armistice agreements.) All the other nations (United Kingdom, France, U.S.S.R., People's Republic of China, Laos, Cambodia, and the People's Republic of Vietnam [North Vietnam]) at this Conference, except the State of Vietnam (South Vietnam), accepted the agreements drawn there. South Vietnam, with our backing, refused to carry out the provisions of the 1954 Geneva Agreement for elections in North and South Vietnam to form one government and instead set its course against the intent of this agreement. South Vietnam refused to permit the elections, began its military buildup, and prepared for the inevitable war of Vietnamese against Vietnamese, with both sides drawing on outside aid to maintain the fight. From here on it is the old familiar story of who first violated the accords or the intent of the accords, etc., etc. The fact that we first refused to accept them puts both the United States and South Vietnam in a dubious role—in the objective light of history—a role our Government has been diligent to gloss over. We refused to permit "free elections" in Vietnam because we were sure we would lose them.

When we found the 1954 Geneva Agreements unacceptable to us, although acceptable to the other signatory nations, we had two broad alternatives open to us. One alternative was to reject the final conclusions of the Conference, disregarding thereby the majority decision, and continue our own bilateral policy with South Vietnam. This we chose to do.

The second alternative was to seek a higher forum than the Geneva Conference nations. Resort to the United Nations through various possible approaches would have involved all who were concerned with peace and freedom, which we alleged were threatened in Indochina. The U.N. supervised an election and a plebiscite on the restoration of the monarchy in war-torn Greece in 1946. The conditions were hardly worse in all Vietnam in 1954, or even 1956, when a general election was to be held in July of that year. To those who say that a U.N.-supervised election in Vietnam would not have been acceptable to North Vietnam and Communist China, one answer is that we never tried this course of action and hence we can't say what the response might have been. Instead, we pressed for a southeast Asian military security pact, which Secretary Dulles had urged in 1954.

The Eisenhower administration had just swallowed the bitter pill of negotiating with Communist China and North Korea an armistice in the Korean war. The Republican campaign oratory of 1952 would have sounded

hollow and mocking indeed if the Dullesian trumpets of "liberation from communism" had sounded another retreat on the "roll-back" front. Some prominent Republicans had wanted our fighting forces to join the Indochinese fray in early 1954, beside France, but the general in the commander in chief's chair had overruled that, as he had rejected any renewal of fighting in Korea above the 38th parallel. Nevertheless, Republican leaders knew from innumerable charges of their own what a powerful weapon the Democrats would have in our domestic politics if the Republican administration now lost Indochina. Ironically enough, as with mainland China allegedly lost by the Democrats, the United States never had Indochina and couldn't have held it if we had tried. Therefore, another war in Asia was not a feasible political course for a U.S. administration, even one led by a five-star general.

Yet we did decide to try to hold at least part of Indochina; namely, the new State of Vietnam below the 17th parallel. And so the newest phase of Western adventure in Indochina began with that decision. We have been trying for 10 years to prove it a sound one.

In retrospect the foundations for our 1954 decision appear to be part fact and part myth—a fairly common mix in foreign as well as domestic policy decisions. The facts were that (1) southeast Asia was a recognized target of Communist subversion and possible takeover; (2) many of the native occupants of the Indochinese peninsula wanted no part of a future regime that might be dominated by Communist-oriented leaders. For religious, economic, and political reasons many feared the kind of society they would have if Ho Chi Minh and others of his strong Communist belief became the new rulers of this war-weary part of Asia. The foreign businessmen, rubber planters, and mine operators also, of course, feared the consequences of a Communist regime.

Moreover, the United States had become so conspicuously identified with the French in their struggle against Ho Chi Minh, albeit in the name of defense against international communism, that no further action by us now would mean that we, as well as the French, had gone down to defeat in another sector of the containment periphery of militant anticommunism.

So much for three quite substantial facts: a strong Communist drive for southeast Asia; internal Indochinese anti-Communist opinion; and the posture, or "face," of the United States if no further efforts were made to "save" Indochina.

On the side of the myths that entered into our policy calculations, directly or indirectly, there was first the one, still often expressed, that it was possible to "draw a line" beyond which there would not be tolerated any expansion of Communist control. This appealing myth evokes images of a resolute U.S. cavalry stand at the pass, or "ils ne passeront" at Verdun in World War I, or a more sophisticated but still quite naive "containment of communism" concept. Thinking of communism as an ideology ought to make people chary of expounding on "drawing a line" to stop the spread of ideas. Interestingly, history provides no example of appealing ideas having been impeded effectively in their spread and adoption because of lines drawn on political maps.

The second myth that we embraced was that military action would be an acceptable substitute for basic political and social action. Again the lessons of the bitter and frustrating American experience in Nicaragua, Haiti, and Santo Domingo in the years between World Wars I and II were passed over or rejected, if ever remembered. Military force—if sufficient in amount and ruthless enough in direction—can suppress rebellions, but rarely has it produced the reforms of conditions which lead men to join the ranks

Approved For Release 2004/01/16 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000500330003-1

of the United States. We entered to continue some economic and technical aid with military support, but the rationale for military measures has prevailed increasingly as our efforts in Indochina have persisted. The creation of SEATO in 1954 epitomizes this futile faith in military power to solve the problems of disorder in politically inchoate states desperately in need of social reform.

The third myth that we followed was the "domino" theory of the inevitable loss of all of Asia and a vital threat to our own continental security if any additional part of Asia came under Communist control. This theory was the delight of Senator William Knowland, who trumpeted it in the Senate and across the land as if it had the infallibility of Newton's law of gravity. Even President Kennedy repeated the arguments of the "domino" theory and few voices were raised to question its logic of inevitable, irresistible and sequential massive defeat once the first (additional) little domino fell against the bastions of our friends.

The domino theory overlooks the possibility of strong reaction by other nations at different points when they are confronted by new circumstances clearly threatening their security. The theory assumes that all powerful forces are on only one side, always moving outward, and it neglects the possibility of disruptive internal forces and counterforces moving against the presumed massive seismic wave set in motion by any little change of political status. It is a negative, fearful, and mechanistic view of politics and man, but for those very reasons it finds countless advocates.

So we took some facts and added some myths and came up with a decision—many times reaffirmed—to deny all southeast Asia to communism, with military aid, and we created SEATO to do the job for us. Ten years later this queasy foundation of fact and myth finds us mired very deeply and sinking in more and more. After expending many billions of dollars and sacrificing hundreds of lives in combat or related services, after twistings and turnings of CIA undercover operations, with resulting changes of leaders in some of the states, there is still no end in sight.

What could we have done that we didn't do? If it had been possible for the Republicans to have done otherwise—or for the Democrats to have altered that policy after they took over in 1961—one would like to think that they would surely have done so. The losses of American lives, the outpouring of many billions of taxpayers' dollars and the strains on our friendship with many other nations which have not seen the issues as we have seen them, would not normally be called assets to any political party seeking voter support. And so the American people have been told over and over that there were—and still are—no other alternatives but to stand on the 17th parallel (or well south of it) and fight the devils (allegedly all from the north) in the ancient battlegrounds of Indochina. What we have done is intervene in a third civil war in Asia; China and Korea being the other two very costly interventions.

Until recently, too, we have lacked critical voices which, while not acting as "the devil's advocate," would at least ask if we are sure that what we are attempting is the only possible alternative acceptable to our people. Like McKinley and the Philippines, the vast majority of the American people in 1954 had only the vaguest notion of where Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam were—and they cared less. Do they even now believe these areas so vital to their welfare that every extensive and longer-term involvement is all that we can consider?

In due time, probably later than would have been an optimum time for us, we will be forced to face the "unthinkable" possibility of the neutralization of all of the Indo-

Chinese peninsula. Secretary of State Rusk and Secretary of Defense McNamara repeatedly say that no thought is being given to this alternative to our present massive military aid-cum-cheers-for-Khanh as our approach to the problem. The McNamara shuttle to Saigon carries threadbare calls for "greater resolve" and warnings of "an unforeseeable end to the effort," and then the familiar and unconvincing reports of "gratifying progress" and "encouraging developments" on the westbound run back to Washington. In the meantime, the Vietcong strike villages and cities at will in South Vietnam and simultaneously detail spare forces to push their campaign in Laos. Recruits and military equipment are picked up in abundance from the South Vietnamese civilian and military forces.

"Why are we involved in southeast Asia?" "Where do we go for the next 10 years?" These are the questions that beg and receive no clear answers, other than "Carry on. What was valid in 1954 is still valid in 1964" although the Asian world has changed greatly since then. At some point—and soon perhaps—we must face up to: (1) our dubious legal position in South Vietnam, with our shooting and destroying of military forces under the thin deceit of being "advisers"; (2) the soundness of our continuing passivity toward a strong role for the U.N. in southeast Asian strife, while at the same time we have pressed for U.N. action in the intermediate fighting of the Congo, Cyprus and the Middle East; (3) a new look at neutralization of "border" areas between East and West in Asia and the established examples, both satisfactory and unsatisfactory, of neutralization in Europe and elsewhere; (4) a hard review of all our interests in Asia eventually in conference with Communist China; and (5) abandoning the shibboleth of containing communism along artificial latitudes or longitudes. The truth is that the ideological appeal of Marxist doctrine and the reforms that communists often has espoused effectively appeal to many people around the world; and the spread of these ideas will not be stopped by military fiat. Nor will it help at all to continue the repeated plaintive lament of Secretary Rusk that there would be peace in Indo-China if only the North Vietnamese and the Chinese would leave their neighbors alone. If all countries would leave their neighbors alone, it would be a very different world, but it is not realistic to expect this change in our times. To expend the war would assure only another Korea or worse, with all the possibilities of a nuclear war.

Will the new year or the postelection period see us reexamine our decade of active defense in southeast Asia's Indochinese Peninsula? Perhaps not; it has become a habit to argue as we have for so long. Apparently only a Senator WAYNE MORSE can change his mind as fully as the circumstances require and still retain his following. Politics does not stop at the water's edge, but rather it governs all we do. Only a statesman above politics can change our course now. Events in Indochina may not wait for our politicians to clear the November election hurdle before they can lead our discontented people to a new and more realistic settlement in southeast Asia, and extricate us from a misadventure born of good motives based on some faulty calculations and expectations.

#### THE ONLY WAR WE HAVE GOT

(By Daniel F. Ford)

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—You hear the phrase everywhere. A young special forces captain, fresh from Okinawa declares, "All I want from Vietnam is the CIB" (the combat infantryman's badge, a long rifle on a blue field with a silver wreath behind it). "Hell, man, it is the only war we have got." And an earnest major in corps

headquarters says: "You will meet the bravest and best soldiers in the U.S. Army right here. This is the only war we have got, and I would rotate the whole Army through here if I could. As it is, I am told the volunteers are backed up for 4 months."

Which is one reason why we are fighting a war and losing a revolution in South Vietnam. The backbone of any army is its NCO's and company-grade officers, and it is no accident that most of the American advisers attached to the Vietnamese Army are sergeants, first lieutenants, and captains in their 20's. A man must see combat before he is truly a soldier. Our World War II veterans are middle-age desk soldiers now, and even our Korean veterans are in their 30's and passing beyond the stage where they might be leading platoons and companies in a future war. Thus there is a very human desire on the part of the U.S. Army to exploit the chaos in southeast Asia to train a new generation of combat-experienced soldiers.

Not all American servicemen in south Vietnam share this attitude. Many, probably a majority, did not want to come here, and now that they are here they would like nothing better than to go home. But the professional soldiers are positively gleeful at this chance to advance their professional status.

Professionalism is not the only reason we are overemphasizing the military's role in southeast Asia. There is also the fact that soldiers are bound to view affairs from a military standpoint, even if the results are discouraging, as they have been so far. The appointment of Gen. Maxwell Taylor as our Ambassador to South Vietnam can hardly be expected to reverse this tendency.

But even more crucial is our refusal to name the fighting here for what it is: a revolution. For a people born out of a revolution, we are strangely reluctant to recognize the symptoms in other lands. We insist that this is war—guerrilla war, limited war, counterinsurgency war, some kind of war—despite all evidence to the contrary. I have spent 2 months in South Vietnam. I have been shot at, rained on, and chewed by insects, but never have I had the feeling that I was witnessing a war. Most correspondents who go out into the field have a similar experience. Full-scale battles are such a rarity here that when one does take place, like the Do Xa operation in June, the trophies are flown to Saigon for exhibition, and mass decorations are awarded in the public squares.

I tried the notion of revolution upon several American advisers. The most common retort was: "If this isn't a war, why are they shooting at me?" I pointed out that men were being shot for civil rights activities in the States. Was that war? "But they're not using automatic weapons," was the reply, ignoring the fact that most of the Vietcong's automatic weapons have been captured from government forces.

A more sophisticated argument goes like this: Revolutions are indigenous to the country, while the fighting in South Vietnam is directed from Hanoi. This "masked aggression" theory is official Army doctrine. Quite apart from the fact that most revolutions—including our own—were assisted by foreign powers, it overlooks the evidence which suggests that even hard-core Vietcong are recruited locally. They may have been sent to North Vietnam for training, but most of them were born south of the 17th parallel. And our trust in military force is helping guarantee that this situation will continue. As long as the countryside is considered enemy territory, the Vietnamese-American campaign will generate as many Vietcong guerrillas as it kills. That is one reason why our estimate of hard-core Vietcong strength—25,000 to 30,000 men—has remained almost constant since 1961.

In a wry echo of the headquarters major, an elderly representative of the U.S. Operations Mission (USOM is the local alias of the Agency for International Development) said to me:

"We have some of the finest soldiers in the world assigned to South Vietnam. But what does a military man know about the people? Will they talk to a soldier, knowing what they do of soldiers? No. But I am a fat old man; they talk to me. They ask me why the United States talks about democracy while it is supporting a military dictatorship. They ask me why we talk about freedom when we are taking them from their homes and herding them into strategic hamlets, like criminals. I have no answer.

"What would he do for a Western victory in South Vietnam?

"We should cut our military advisers to the 1962 level, 5,000 or 6,000 men, and put the difference into volunteers who know the people, who want to help the people. Like the IVS workers (International Voluntary Service, similar to the Peace Corps and predating it). The people trust them. I have never heard of an IVS worker being harmed, or even threatened. Soldiers must travel in convoys here, but the IVS can go anywhere."

Quality goes down as numbers go up, but there is no doubt that several thousand young volunteers—teachers, nurses and technicians—could do far more than the same number of soldiers to bring Western ideals to South Vietnam. And they could do it far more cheaply. The Peace Corps has functioned admirably around the world without benefit of officers' clubs, post exchanges and all the other accessories that go with a U.S. Army compound.

It would be unfair to suggest that our military effort in South Vietnam is entirely confined to hunting the elusive Vietcong. The army is trying hard to adjust to the demands of revolution, by whatever name. "Civil action" is almost a cant phrase in military circles these days—there is even a new S-5 section in the Army staff organization, devoted to psychological warfare and civic action. Army engineers are digging wells and building bridges all over South Vietnam, and Special Forces is constructing a model farm near Pleiku where montagnard peasants can learn to use fertilizer and irrigation pipes. There are dedicated, inventive soldiers in every outfit, but any ex-GI knows how much of this dedication and inventiveness is destined to be smothered by the routine of army life. Whatever the U.S. military is doing now to help the Vietnamese, the same number of volunteer civilians could do far more.

Opportunities are particularly abundant in the central highlands where the montagnard population is only beginning to emerge from the dark ages. A few miles from Pleiku, the military headquarters for fully one-fourth of South Vietnam, I visited montagnard settlements which had never seen a doctor or a schoolteacher.

"Talk about people that don't have a chance," one American captain said in amazement. "What will these kids do with their lives? Why, I'll bet if you asked every one of the 400 people in this village who the premier of their country was, they wouldn't be able to tell you."

That was overstating the extent of education among the montagnards. Most of them do not know that they have a country, let alone a premier.

I asked the USOM representative in Pleiku why we did not spend more of our money for schools, instead of for armored personnel carriers. "A schoolteacher here earns 600 piasters a month—about \$8," he said. "A coolie sweeping the streets can earn 30 piasters a day. We can't recruit enough teachers to staff the schools we are building."

So I asked him why we didn't match the teachers' salaries with an equal amount from American funds, and he could only shrug.

The highlands are an especially fertile area for such programs because they are militarily quiet. The Mekong Delta may have deteriorated too far for education, agriculture and medicine to win the countryside back from the Vietcong, and there a military solution may be the only feasible one. But the highlands are a different matter. The Vietcong operates only in small units, usually consisting of irregulars, and even the U.S. military regards two vehicles as a sufficient convoy in most areas. For this reason the highlands have the lowest priority in everything—even in the assignment of IVS and USOM workers. Yet if the military believed its own doctrine—that the revolution here is a war staged and supplied from North Vietnam—surely the opposite should be the case. The highlands are the logical infiltration route from Laos and Cambodia. If the montagnards were won over to the Vietnamese Government, the Vietcong supply line would be cut and (if the military view is correct) their war in the delta would be choked off. Whether the "masked aggression" theory is right or wrong, we are making a tragic mistake in the highlands.

More likely, the fighting in the delta would continue even if the highlands were pacified. But that is a military assessment, and our error in South Vietnam has been to think in military terms. A peaceful, prosperous central highlands would demonstrate to the rest of the nation that the Government has more to offer than the Vietcong. Victory for the West in this revolution waits upon that demonstration. If we make it, we shall win; if we do not, we deserve to lose.

I shall never forget the afternoon I watched three young men through binoculars, convinced that they were hard core Vietcong soldiers. They were strong featured and alert, dressed in black; they were cooking dinner behind a boulder about 500 yards from the spot where our strike force patrol was taking a 10-minute break. A squad had been sent out to encircle them. But the young men heard the snap and rustle of moving soldiers. They stood up, ready to flee. The American Special Forces sergeant in charge of the patrol decided to fire while he still had a target. He fired twice, aiming into a cleft in the boulder, and his buddy did the same. Then we sprinted up the hill. The three young men had fled, unharmed, leaving behind not weapons but a much-thumbed copybook of the kind used in rural schools.

The sergeant was troubled by the idea of shooting at schoolboys.

"Well, I'm glad we missed," he said. Then he brightened. "But if those guys weren't Vietcong an hour ago, they sure as hell are by now."

Things were right in his world again. He did not seem at all concerned by the likelihood that, instead of lessening the Vietcong threat, our patrol had added to it.

#### PROBLEMS IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Johnson's Problems in the Mediterranean," written by James Reston, and published in the New York Times of August 19, 1964.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### JOHNSON'S PROBLEMS IN THE MEDITERRANEAN (By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, August 18.—The rising opposition in the Congress to U.S. foreign military aid is vividly illustrated by the current Greek-Turkish crisis over Cyprus.

For the Congress is now confronted by the fact that the Greeks and Turks are withdrawing U.S. military equipment from the North Atlantic alliance and threatening to use these American supplies on one another.

This has put the Johnson administration in a delicate and untenable position. The President does not want to pass judgment on who is to blame for the fighting on Cyprus, but at the same time, he cannot explain to the Congress why American arms intended to maintain the peace are being diverted for possible military action on Cyprus.

From 1946 to 1963, the United States supplied military aid to Greece totaling \$1,656 million. The total for Turkey in this same period was \$2,404 million. In the fiscal year 1963, the Greek allocation was \$85,800,000 and the Turkish \$160,800,000.

#### THE LEGAL RESTRICTIONS

That these impressive sums should be voted for arms to bring some kind of decent order into the eastern Mediterranean and then be used in part in the bitter communal struggle in Cyprus is the sort of thing that makes the Congress balk every time the foreign aid bill comes to debate.

President Johnson has been trying quietly to bring an end to the fighting. He sent this week a curt note to President Makarios ignoring the latter's plea for more aid and advising him bluntly to cooperate with the United Nations and avoid any action that might make the bitter struggle between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots any worse than it now is.

Meanwhile, disturbed by the Turkish use of American planes and arms to attack the Greek Cypriots, he has been in personal communication with the Turkish Government to halt all military activities. The answer of both the Ankara and Athens governments was to withdraw arms from the NATO command.

This sort of thing cannot, however, go on without placing the foreign aid program of the United States in jeopardy. In fact, continued defiance of Washington's requests for a peaceful settlement of the Cyprus dispute, and constant vilification of the United States for its efforts to produce a peaceful settlement there can easily force the President to cut off aid from both Greece and Turkey.

The bilateral agreement between the United States and Turkey on the furnishing of aid is quite specific on this point. The aid is made available by Washington to help secure the freedom and independence of Turkey and the allies. The U.S. retains the right to withdraw its equipment if its arms are used in such a way as not to further the interests of the United States.

Furthermore, section 506(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 states that "Any country which hereafter uses defense articles or defense services furnished such country under this act . . . in substantial violation of the provisions of this chapter . . . shall be immediately ineligible for further assistance."

Also, the so-called Gruening amendment, to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, section 620(i), insists that "No assistance shall be provided under this or any other act . . . to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against (1) the United States, (2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other act (Cyprus is receiving assistance under the act)."

## THE TURKISH ARGUMENT

There is little doubt here that American arms have been used in the Cyprus crisis in violation of these amendments, but the administration has been hesitating to invoke the law for fear of creating an even more serious crisis within the NATO alliance.

The Turkish argument apparently is that they not only have the right to withdraw their military units and American arms from NATO but that they are using these arms legitimately in protection of their treaty rights in Cyprus.

If this argument can be sustained, however, it is all the more likely to provoke new and sterner amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act to make sure that U.S. arms cannot be used legitimately in any such adventures in the future.

In fact, it is only the preoccupation of the Congress with the presidential election and other matters in the closing days before the Democratic Nominating Convention that is keeping the Cyprus controversy from provoking another anti-foreign-aid storm on Capitol Hill.

Meanwhile, pro-Greek elements in this country, which are vocal and influential in some of the big electoral States, are beginning to demand that military aid to Turkey be cut off and withdrawn. Thus the controversy affects not only the President's relations with the Congress and the allies, but with the voters as well, and he will no doubt be forced to act unless he begins to get some kind of settlement of the dispute before long.

## DOCUMENTATION OF MILITARY POWER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the most useful documents published anywhere in the world is the annual summary of military power, published by the Institute of Strategic Studies, in London. If one sought in the United States the information that is contained in this document, much of it would be marked "Secret." This bears out the point which the senior Senator from Oregon has made for many years, namely, that the American people are being given a "snow job" by their Government. Citizens are being denied access to the public business in regard to the military power of the United States. It is business which they are entitled to know.

This British document contains much military information that one cannot get from the Pentagon.

This article shows how perfectly absurd our so-called top secret policy is in the United States. It serves for the most part only to deny to the American people the facts which they should have if they are properly to judge and to appraise the unsound policies of the United States in the field of military aid and in the building up of a war machine in this country far beyond the kind of war machine we need to protect the security of the free world.

In my judgment, as I have said this annual summary of the world's military power published by the Institute of Strategic Studies in London, is one of the most useful documents published anywhere in the world.

As I did last year, I am going to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that it will be more readily available to Americans who are interested in the facts of the world's military power.

I particularly call attention to the analysis of the military strength of Communist China. This report indicates that while China maintains an armed force of 2,476,000, it has 130 million men of military age. It also estimates that China's military power has declined over the last 5 years, and that its concentration of forces has moved away from the Taiwan Straits to China's northern and southern borders.

I also point out that the Institute estimates the size of the Soviet Army at no more than 2,300,000 and possibly only 2 million. It also describes a 25 percent downward revision of Soviet tactical air strength, and a doubling of the number of nuclear-powered submarines compared to last year.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire publication "The Military Balance, 1963-64" printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## THE MILITARY BALANCE, 1963-64

## FOREWORD

This is the fifth of the institute's annual estimates of the nature and size of military forces of the principal powers involved in the cold war. It covers the Communist bloc and those countries with which the United States has mutual defense treaties. This year information has also been included on a number of important nonaligned countries.

The institute assumes full responsibility for the facts and judgments which the pamphlet contains. It owes a considerable debt to a number of its own members and consultants who have cooperated in compiling and checking the material. However, not all countries have been equally cooperative in producing information and some figures have been estimated.

This pamphlet examines the military balance as it existed at the end of October 1963, and as it will, on present indications, change during the ensuing year. No longer-range projections of force levels or weapons beyond 1964 have been included.

The material in this pamphlet should not be regarded as a comprehensive guide to the nature of the balance of strategic power: it does not reflect the facts of geography, vulnerability, efficiency, etc., on both sides. It may, however, be found useful in the context of discussions on disarmament and the general balance of power.

## Note on the figures

Manpower figures given are those of regular forces, although an indication of the size of paramilitary forces, militia or reserve forces, has been given in the sections dealing with individual countries. Naval strengths are those of active fleets and ships in commission only, except where otherwise stated. All vessels of less than 100 tons standard displacement have been excluded. Fighting ships below 400 tons have been classed as light coastal units. Figures for defense budgets are exclusive of American military aid. Fighter and strike squadrons of allied air forces have 35 aircraft and wings have 75 aircraft, except where otherwise stated.

## PART I. THE COMMUNIST POWERS

## The Soviet Union. population: 225 million

The main lines of Soviet defense policy in 1963 have changed little from those of the preceding 2 years. The slow buildup of the strategic deterrent force of ICBM's is continuing. Soviet policy still lays stress on high-yield warheads for the small number of missiles available. It would appear that the deployment of MRBM's is now complete.

The procurement of the longer range IRBM's, of the type which were first publicly known to be operational when launching pads for them were built in Cuba in 1962, is probably continuing.

Defense expenditure has increased slightly. This is probably due to the demands of research and development, and to some extent of the modernization of the armed forces. It is notable that the U.S.S.R. is continuing the procurement of medium-range supersonic bombers which are clearly expected to continue in service for the foreseeable future. Though the Soviet Union has a force of fleet ballistic missiles, it is doubtful whether Soviet claims to have developed a true equivalent to the American Polaris submarines can yet be taken literally.

But although the main lines of Soviet policy are unchanged, there have been a number of developments which indicate changes of emphasis, and to some extent of force levels. In the spring of 1963, the Chief of the General Staff, Marshal Zakharov, was replaced by Marshal Biryuzov who had previously held the key posts of chief of Soviet air defense from 1955-62 and commander of the strategic rocket forces from 1962-63. The increasing influence of officers with a scientific background which this indicated is likely to continue. Marshal Malinovsky, the Defense Minister, may be the last of the generation of military commanders whose authority arises from the part they played in the Second World War. It should, however, be noted that the book "Military Strategy," edited by Marshal Sokolovsky, has been criticized in the Soviet Union over the past year, not only for ignoring the importance of scientific developments in determining military strategy, but also for paying no attention to the political and ideological factors in maintaining morale and military efficiency. The debate between traditional military leaders and younger technocrats will doubtless continue in the years ahead. From the Soviet viewpoint the most noticeable feature of the Sokolovsky book was perhaps the fact that for the first time it presented an accurate picture to the Russian public of the strategic strength of the United States. The book has been criticized for ignoring the possible circumstances in which nuclear weapons could not be used if war broke out: the significance of this criticism may be revealed when the revised edition of the book appears later this year.

The test ban treaty is unlikely to inhibit Soviet development and advance in the one field where Soviet prowess is apparently inferior to that of the United States—very low yield nuclear weapons. Official doctrine has, however, laid little stress on these in the past. The treaty may inhibit the antiballistic missile program, but it would appear that the Soviet Union has resigned itself to a period without any effective defense against missiles, and believes that the same will be true of the United States. This resignation seems to be a part of the general Soviet approach to the present strategic confrontation: it appears that the Soviet authorities are debating future policy in terms of their own resources and of the current strategic controversies within NATO before they decide whether any large reorientation of their own policy is necessary.

Meanwhile the Sino-Soviet dispute provides a complicating factor. Apart from 17 Soviet divisions in the Far East, troops already in central Asia, and a few detachments beyond Lake Baikal, the Soviet Union has no military formations other than border guards, along its border with China. There is unlikely to be any shift of forces from Europe or European Russia, but there might be military pressure for a reactivation of the cadre divisions in the Soviet Union, and a reorganization of naval and air defense. It is doubtful whether this policy will be put into effect. In European Rus-